

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, OCTOBER 13, 1877.

CURRENT TOPICS.

A MEETING of the judges was held on Thursday last to consider the arrangements for the ensuing Winter Assizes.

THE MOST ELABORATE ESTIMATE yet attempted of the effect of the Judicature Acts was given by the President of the Incorporated Law Society in his inaugural address at Bristol. The first result he points out is a remarkable increase in the business of the courts. In the Chancery Division the number of actions and other proceedings commenced in the first year of the new system was about double the average number in the Court of Chancery. In the Common Law Divisions, on the other hand, as compared with 1874, there had been a falling off of about a sixth in the number of writs issued; but this is fully accounted for by the fact that no less than 30,338 actions were commenced in the district registries—showing on the total figures an increase over the last year of the old system of upwards of 20,000 actions, in a large number of which, however, no appearance was entered. Next, as to the distribution of work between the divisions, the result has been to falsify the confident predictions that business would travel from Lincoln's-inn to Westminster. Causes turning on questions of fact have been brought to the Chancery Division in larger numbers than they came to the Court of Chancery; for the simple reasons, first, that suitors and their advisers prefer trial before a judge to trial before a judge and jury; next, that evidence can now be given in a rational mode in the Chancery Division; and last, but not least, that the suitor in the Chancery Division is sure of having his cause heard and decided by a judge, however complicated and elaborate the details may be, while in the Common Law Divisions he is not unlikely to have it referred either to an official referee or a barrister. Turning to the new practice, the president justly described the process for obtaining judgment on a specially-indorsed writ as a remarkable success. There is an end to the mockery of trying undefended causes. The new mode of pleading, which compels the party to show his hand, is also pronounced to have been a success, especially on the common law side of the court, and the provisions for counter-claims have worked well, and saved much litigation. And lastly we have a Court of Appeal the constitution of which, the president says, is universally admitted to be a complete success. These are results amply justifying the Judicature legislation; but what is to be said on the other side? The provisions as to mode of trial, as we have often pointed out, are radically defective; at every assizes cases are brought up for trial; counsel are retained and witnesses summoned only to take part in the solemn farce of remitting the case to an arbitrator. There are also to be added to the account of the defects of the new system the inconveniences arising from simultaneous sittings; and the single-judge system in the Common Law Divisions cannot be said as yet to be successful. But when all

these and other defects not enumerated are allowed for, the result must be admitted to be that the greatest legal revolution of modern times has proved a success.

THE RESOLUTION unanimously passed by the meeting at Bristol "That the present legalized system of charging for non-contentious business was unsatisfactory both to the public and the profession; that for some time past a scale had been partially in operation, to the great satisfaction of all parties, and that, whilst the thanks of the profession are due to the council for the efforts made to obtain an authorized scale of charges, this meeting is firmly of opinion that a further effort should be made for this object," will, we hope, help on the progress of a reform which is, we believe, equally desirable in the interests both of the public and the profession. The public want to know when they buy or mortgage property how much they will have to pay to their lawyer; the lawyer wants to be saved the task of raking up again business already disposed of in order to frame an intelligible bill of costs; the way to accomplish these results and at the same time to ensure that remuneration bears some proportion to the skill and labour bestowed, and responsibility incurred, is to adopt the system of payment by commission. A scale of commission sanctioned by the Incorporated Law Society has been for some years before the profession; the next step is to get it generally discussed, and if deemed necessary revised, and then to have it sanctioned by statute.

THE BUSINESS transacted at the vacation sitting on Thursday was not very important. An interesting legal point—namely, whether a liquidation under the Irish Bankruptcy Act, subsequent to an order of attachment by an English court, suspends the operation of the latter, on the principle of *Cobham v. Dalton* (23 W. R. 865, L. R. 10 Ch. 655), stands for judgment until the 24th inst. Two injunction cases were of some interest. The first was to restrain the late assistant of a doctor from committing any breach of an agreement not to practise as a "surgeon, doctor of medicine, or apothecary" within three miles of his master's house. The defendant had attended one midwifery case, had gone round to several of the patients stating he was going to set up in business within half a mile of his late master's premises, had sent medicine to other patients, and had lanced one person's gums. The only defence was that he intended to act only as a man midwife, which was not within the terms of the agreement, and Mr. Justice Lopes saw no difficulty in granting an injunction. The other case was a somewhat peculiar one. The defendant company was incorporated and registered in June last for the purpose of publishing the "*A.*" News, a local paper. They took offices, advertised the paper, and the first number appeared on the 6th inst. The plaintiff, the proprietor of another local paper in the same district, and which had been carried on for some time prior to June, under the title of the "*B.*" Paper, suddenly, in July, as he alleged without any notice of the formation of the defendant company, altered the title of his paper to the "*A.*" News and "*B.*" Paper, and forthwith registered this new title at Stationers' Hall. He subsequently again altered the title of his paper, and continued to publish the same under these various names to the present time. On the appearance of the defendants' paper the plaintiff moved for an injunction to restrain them from using the name of the "*A.*" News as a piracy on his title. There was a conflict of evidence on the affidavits as to the plaintiff's knowledge of the registration of the company. The plaintiff's counsel relied on *Maxwell v. Hogg* (L. R. 2 Ch. 307), as showing that the defendants could not acquire any copyright in the name by anticipation; but under the circumstances, having regard to the contradictory statements, the judge was of opinion that it was not a case in which to grant an injunction on the interlocutory application.

THE TRUSTEES' DUTY.

IV.

(2) *The trustee must not unnecessarily act by the hand of another* (concluded).

So far we have discussed the rules of law on this subject; we have now to consider the effect of modifications made in those rules by settlers. The best known of these is, of course, the time-honoured trap for trustees known as the indemnity clause. We need hardly refer to the affectionate trustfulness with which this clause has been regarded by generations of deluded trustees. "Few persons," said Mr. Jarman, "will undertake trusts where indemnity provisions are omitted, and too many are induced by their misplaced confidence in them to forego provisions which prudence would dictate as the proper rule of the conduct of men who are dealing with property not their own, of which they have undertaken to be the vigilant and zealous guardians" (8 By. & Jarm. 362). The clause, so far as it relates to the subject in hand, purports to make each trustee chargeable only with such money as shall come to his hands, and to exempt him from liability for the acts or defaults of his co-trustees, or for joining in receipts for conformity, or for any loss, unless the same shall happen through his wilful default. It is obvious that, as regards signing receipts, the clause merely repeats what we have already seen to be the law, viz., that a trustee does not become liable by merely signing a receipt, if he can show that the money has not been received by him; and the rest of the clause relating to the present subject comes to little more than what a court of equity would have done without any direction (*Dawson v. Clarke*, 18 Ves. at p. 254; *Leigh v. Barry*, 3 Atk. at p. 584). The courts have steadily refused to allow the clause to be used as a shield for trustees desirous of acting by other hands, or guilty of want of vigilance in looking after the trust fund in the hands of their co-trustees (see *Dax v. Barford*, 19 Beav. 409), or in recovering sums due to the trust estate from such co-trustees. Thus, in *Mucklow v. Fuller* (Jac. 198), one of the trustees was held liable for the loss by the insolvency of his co-trustee of a sum due by such co-trustee to the testatrix, and which was directed by her will (containing the usual indemnity clause) to be got in and invested on Government stock or security, but which had been left in the hands of the trustee-debtor for many years after the testatrix's death (see also *Bone v. Cook*, McCl. 168); and in *Hanbury v. Kirkland*, (3 Sim. 265), notwithstanding this clause, trustees were held liable for enabling a co-trustee to get into his hands trust property on the representation that he had an opportunity of investing it on mortgage (see also *Underwood v. Stevens*, 1 Mer. 712). In *Hanbury v. Kirkland* the fact of the existence of an indemnity clause in the settlement seems to have been noticed in the argument for the defendants, and it was urged that as there had been no wilful default on their part, they were protected by the clause, and in *Williams v. Nixon* (2 Beav. 472) the ground seems to have been taken, in argument for the defendant, that he had proved the will on the faith of the indemnity clause, which declared that he should not be answerable for the defaults of his co-executor, and that in the face of such a declaration the court ought not to visit him with such defaults; but in neither of these cases was the matter referred to in the judgment. Another attempt seems to have been made, in 1847, in *Fenwick v. Greenwell* (10 Beav. at p. 416), to set up the indemnity clause on behalf of the defendants; but in 1858, in *Brunridge v. Brunridge* (27 Beav. 5), the late Master of the Rolls stated, once for all, his views on the subject. "This clause," he said, "is constantly brought forward to sanction the misapplication of trust moneys; but until it is provided by the instrument creating the trust that the trustee shall be liable for no breach of trust provided he does not obtain a personal advantage, I shall not consider the clause as giving a

trustee the right or liberty of conniving at a breach of trust."

It is curious that the effect of this clause in the case of executors (where it is expressly extended to them) has been so constantly overlooked. It is practically inoperative as to trustees, because trustees are not liable for joining in receipts, if they can show that the money was not received by them; but, as we saw last week, executors are liable for joining in a receipt where they have exercised control over the money received, and joining in the receipt is in most cases treated as showing such exercise of control. In the case of executors the indemnity clause would be useful in relieving them of this liability, and this practical operation seems to be what Lord Northington referred to in his remarks in *Westley v. Clarke* (1 Eden. at p. 360), which have been supposed to indicate a desire to impart additional efficacy to the clause in the case of trustees. Lord Northington was dealing with the case of an executor who had joined in a receipt, and he laid considerable stress on the indemnity clause relating to executors, and said that "the testator might direct the condition of his executor so as not to be questioned by his volunteers. The proviso, therefore that one executor should not be answerable for the acts of another, though not frequent in wills, is a good proviso between executors and legatees who take under the same will." The distinction suggested between the effect of a legatee and a creditor seeking to charge the executor with the acts of his co-executor is probably not now tenable (see *Sadler v. Hobbs*, 2 Bro. C. C. 117; *Doyle v. Blake*, 2 Sch. & L. 239), but it would seem that Lord Northington was correct in holding that in the case of an executor the indemnity clause might have an important operation.

Bearing this in mind, the legislation on this subject seems to be singular. The effect of Lord St. Leonards' Act (22 & 23 Vict. c. 35, s. 31) is to insert the indemnity clause in any deed, will, or other instrument creating a trust, either expressly or by implication. The clause refers expressly to "trustees" and "trust moneys," and leaves trustees, of course, practically in the same position as that in which they were before. Mr. Davidson, indeed, suggests (3 Conv. 252) that it might, with much the same result as to the liability of trustees, have been enacted that any deed, &c., should be construed as if it did not contain the clause in question. The clause is treated in *Williams on Executors* (p. 1836) as having "fully settled" the non-liability of executors—i.e., the clause is taken to be inserted in every will appointing executors. If this is really the meaning, it is curious the Act was not more clearly expressed. If it is not the meaning, executors, who really require such a provision, are left without it.

By properly framed provisions, however, a trustee may be effectually secured against loss by the default of his co-trustee whom he has enabled to obtain possession of the trust property. Thus in *Wilkins v. Hogg* (3 Giff. 116, affirmed 10 W. R. 47) a will, in addition to the usual indemnity clause, contained a clause (taken from Hayes and Jarman's Concise Forms) providing that "any trustee who should pay to his co-trustee, or enable him to receive, moneys for the general purposes of the will should not be obliged to see to the due application thereof, or be subsequently rendered responsible by an express notice or intimation of the actual misapplication of the same moneys," and two trustees who had concurred in paying trust-money to a third trustee, by whom it was misapplied, were held not liable. The effect of the clause, the Lord Chancellor said (10 W. R. 47), was to discharge any one of the trustees who handed over the trust estate from liability in the event of misapplication.

The practical lesson for trustees to be derived from the rule we have been considering seems to be this: that the law is in direct conflict with a common mode of administering trusts. Under that mode either the exclusive management of the whole of the trust estate is

committed to one trustee, or the exclusive management of different parts of the trust estate is committed, by arrangement, to different trustees. Both of these plans are improper, and may subject the non-acting trustees to serious consequences. If a trustee does not intend to manage the trust property by his own hands, he ought to see that a special indemnity clause is inserted in the settlement or will by which he is appointed.

LEGISLATION OF THE YEAR.

LAW OF EVIDENCE.

CAP. 14.—*An Act for the Amendment of the Law of Evidence in certain Cases of Misdemeanour.*

THIS enactment further restricts the rule of law which disables an accused person from giving evidence. The 14 & 15 Vict. c. 99, s. 3, preserved the old common law disability by enacting that "nothing herein contained shall render any person who in any criminal proceeding shall be charged with the commission of any indictable offence, or any offence punishable by summary conviction, competent or compellable to give evidence for or against himself or herself." As we have previously pointed out, exceptions to the rule have been from time to time introduced, as by the Merchant Shipping Acts of 1871 and 1876, the Licensing Act of 1872, and the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 1875. By the present statute (which consists of only one section) it is provided that "on the trial of any indictment or other proceeding for the non-repair of any public highway or bridge, or for a nuisance to any public highway, river, or bridge, and of any other indictment or proceeding instituted for the purpose of trying or enforcing a civil right only, every defendant to such indictment or proceeding, and the wife or husband of any such defendant, shall be admissible witnesses and compellable to give evidence." This is probably the first instance of an accused person being made "compellable to give evidence," but it does not really contravene the general principle that "no man is bound to criminate himself," for the admissibility of the evidence is confined to cases where a civil right is to be tried or enforced, and, indeed, the indictments and proceedings named in the statute are criminal in form only.

SOLICITORS.

CAP. 25.—*An Act for regulating the Examination of Persons applying to be Admitted Solicitors of the Supreme Court of Judicature in England, and for otherwise amending the Law relating to Solicitors.*

IT is over forty years since, at the instance of the Incorporated Law Society, there was added to the conditions of admission as a solicitor the necessity of passing an effective examination, and ever since the council of the society have conducted the examinations in conjunction with the masters. But the society have done this, not under any jurisdiction of their own, but as the delegates of the judges. By the present Act (which comes into operation, for most purposes, on the 1st of January next, section 3) the entire control of the examinations is conferred on the council of the society (sections 6, 19), and they are empowered to make regulations as to the examinations, which may, however, be vetoed by the Master of the Rolls and one or more of the Presidents of the Common Law Divisions (section 6). The masters are to continue *ex officio* examiners until the Presidents and the Master of the Rolls otherwise order, and one is to act in the conduct of every examination in conjunction with the examiners appointed by the society (section 7). The council are empowered to make rules with respect to the remuneration by fees or otherwise of the examiners (section 6), but the regulations as to fees payable in respect of examinations are to be made by the Presidents

and the Master of the Rolls. An appeal is given to the Master of the Rolls from the refusal of a certificate (section 9). The general exemptions from the preliminary examination are defined (section 10), certain additions being made to them, and the power of exemption is given to the Presidents and the Master of the Rolls in much the same language as in 23 & 24 Vict. c. 127, s. 8. An important new clause provides, in effect, that a barrister of not less than five years' standing, who has procured himself to be disbarred with a view of being a solicitor, and has obtained a certificate from two of the benchers of his Inn, need not pass the intermediate examination (section 12). The Presidents and the Master of the Rolls are also enabled (section 13) to make regulations directing that any person who has passed any examination in any university or college specified in such regulations may be admitted after service under articles for four years.

Section 15 enables the Master of the Rolls, in his discretion, to admit in cases of irregular service under articles substantially equivalent to a regular service; section 17 removes the anomaly of the exclusion of solicitors from practising in the ecclesiastical courts, left standing, as to the Bishop of London's Court, by the Act of 1876; and section 18 enables commissioners for taking oaths in the Supreme Court to take them in ecclesiastical courts or matters.

Special Correspondence.

CODES, DIGESTS, AND TREATISES.

I.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

SIR,—Mr. F. Pollock's book on partnership and your review of it have suggested some remarks on fashions in law making and book making, which may not be unreasonable, while the intermission of compulsory work gives leisure for such *hors d'œuvre* as experiments in writing codes and treatises. Sir James Stephen and Mr. Pollock are anxious to show by precept and example how laws should be expressed and treatises written. They seem to have satisfied themselves that there is but one method for both purposes:—That system of laws or that law book is best which takes the form of a code of abstract propositions illustrated by examples; a code, when enacted, would be the best institute for students and the thing from which laymen might learn most easily their own and their neighbours' rights and duties; and, until we get a code lawyers with sufficient leisure cannot do better than write code-like treatises. Sir James Stephen's "Digests" of the law of evidence and of the criminal law are intended to "assist in their studies those who attend his lectures," and also as steps towards the attaining of a code; and Mr. Pollock has like objects in view. The books are codiform and in no sense digests, but (perhaps because codes are not in good repute) law reformers have got into the way of calling such things digests—an evil way, since the two words are wanted to express two wholly distinct things, and while "code" has never meant a digest, the best jurists in all ages have appropriated "digest" to mean a collection (more or less complete, abbreviated and classified) of the actual living sources of law, or of the essential parts of them, which collection, if made authoritative, would only be so by way of authentication of the contents and exclusion from citation of the rejected matter. A code can never mean anything but a statute or book of enactments, or abstract propositions. A treatise lacking legislative authority is in form a digest so far as it states the effect of the sources of law (whether they be statutes or cases) in their own form; a code so far as it states propositions deduced by the writer from the authorities; and a commentary so far as it criticizes the sources.

Sir James Stephen, in the *Nineteenth Century* for September, has not only explained extremely well the distinction between, and some of the distinctive merits of, codes and digests, but has unfolded a scheme for digesting (in the proper meaning of the word) the existing law. The project is at least as old as Bacon, and has often been revived. As Sir James Stephen has mixed it up with some propositions which I consider objectionable, but cannot here discuss, I prefer to cite from a paper printed in the *Transactions of the Judicial Society* for the 10th of July, 1862, the following suggestions for preparing, and reasons for being contented with, a digest:—

"The statute law is a collection of positive precepts intended to be expressed in precise language, and to be construed as if they were exact and full exponents of the sovereign will. If the provisions of a statute are incomplete or inaccurately expressed, the judge has no power to expand or correct them. Such a law can never rise above the level of the capacity and powers of the individuals who frame it; and, even in proportion to the scientific nicety of its construction, would often be liable to be misunderstood and misapplied, if it were administered without the light of judicial precedents."

"The common law, on the contrary, exists in precedents, and only in precedents. A precedent is a decision on a particular case, involving a principle to be deduced, not literally from the words of the judgment, but by inference from the circumstances and the decisions in that and in other cases founded on or illustrating the same principle. The precision which is essential in a statute is needless in the record of a precedent. The material facts of the case, the decision, and an indication of the grounds of the decision, stated with only so much accuracy as a reporter of ordinary capacity and knowledge can command, are the sole elements of a complete precedent. It sometimes even happens that the judge, while he decides rightly, gives a wrong reason for his judgment, without wholly impairing the value of the precedent. In such a case, the acquiescence of the loser without appeal may afford a presumption that his advisers saw other and better reasons for the decision than those stated by the court. From the report of a case we learn, infallibly and with scarcely any dependence on the accuracy of its language, the precise principle on which the decision proceeded, and for which it is an authority. A cluster of such precedents, associated by a community of subject, presents to us a rule with its limits, qualifications, applications, and exceptions, ascertained after laborious and repeated investigation, deliberation, and discussion, in the closet and in court, during successive generations, by the finest legal intellects, and so expressed as to exhibit the mental processes by which the results were obtained, and not the mere results abstracted in fixed formula, so that, when a precedent directly in point is not found, light may be drawn from others by inference and analogy. Practical lawyers know, what amateur reformers can scarcely be made to credit or even to conceive, that this induction from precedent is at once more easy and more certain than the interpretation of the most exact written law. Upon it alone depends the existence of the law as a science, its applicability to new and unforeseen cases, and such certainty as it has; and the sovereignty of precedent is the origin and guarantee of social and political freedom, for it is the 'breach of custom that is breach of all.' Where precedent is not regarded, law cannot be a science, and no code can secure an impartial, pure, and certain administration of justice; for when the common law is said to be flexible, the meaning is not that it can be bent to the wishes of the executive, but that it is applicable to every new combination of circumstances, by proceeding on principles deduced or deducible, as the laws of nature are, from observation,

and not limited by any text or formal enunciation; and thus the flexibility of the common law and its certainty are due to the same cause.

"A code or statute of common law is a contradiction in terms. The function of the statute law is to supply the omissions of the common law, to alter its rules when they are deemed impolitic, and to abrogate its precedents when they are found to be erroneous. The various clauses of the existing statute law, or at least the modern part of it, may be re-written and re-enacted with verbal corrections in any order of collocation that is thought convenient, and the written law will remain unchanged; but the common law would lose, in codification, every characteristic which gives it its peculiar value. No doubt a code of statute law could be compiled from the common law, and substituted for it. That would be legislation, not consolidation; and the immediate result would be a prodigious increase of uncertainty and litigation, which would be endless if, as consistency would require, the sacrifice of past judicial precedents were accompanied with a veto on the use of those to come. Every case would then be a case of first impression; there would be no general or professional interest in uniformity of decision; each judge would do what seemed right in his own eyes, and his highest measure of right or law would be the fruit of his own intellect, unaided by the accumulated wisdom of ages. The commentaries on the *Code Napoléon* may stand as a warning to all codifiers. That code was not original; it was far better than it could have been if it had been original. More than three-fourths of it (M. Dupin informs us)* were extracted literally from the treatises of Pothier, and other parts were taken from other text-books of the highest reputation. What was the result? The *Code Civil* was promulgated in 1804; the last of the five codes in 1810. A writer in the *Thémis* for 1819, only ten years after the completion of the code, said: 'Since these new tables of the law have been exposed to the public view, ten thousand unforeseen questions have presented themselves to judges and to counsel; a perpetual discussion has been kept up on each article and on each word; ten thousand judgments have been given; many hundreds of treatises and commentaries have been published; many laws, decrees, or orders in council have either abrogated or interpreted the dispositions of the new code; jurisprudence, doctrine, legislation, all accumulate and multiply in a continually increasing progression; and the science of the law will soon become an inextricable labyrinth.'† I am afraid that this prophecy has not been altogether falsified, because precedents have not the same authority in France which is allowed them here.

"But, though we cannot generalize a law which teaches by examples, we may put those examples into a form more convenient than that of the original records. We may revise our reports, expunge precedents which have become obsolete or have been overruled, and express in concise language all that is material of circumstance, argument, decision, or doctrine in those which remain; and we may place together all the precedents which belong to the same head of law; having done this, we may give to our digest the authority which the reports now possess, and we may revise it periodically.

"I will not pretend to estimate with any confidence what proportion in number or bulk of the existing reports is now useless in practice. But, if you consider how many cases are inapplicable to modern institutions and usages; how many relate to statutes, rules, or principles of law which have ceased to be binding; how many decisions are now regarded as bad law; how many reported cases merely affirm, without further illustrating or explaining, principles already established; how many reports are of doubtful credit, or are so imperfect in statement as to be useless; how the report of a decision

* Consider, for example, the decisions on the Statute of Limitations (3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 27), on the Prescription Act, or on the Succession Duty Act.

* "Dissertation sur l'la Vie et les Ouvrages de Pothier." (Ouvrages de Pothier. Paris, 1827.)
† Tom. I. p. 48.

on appeal may supersede the reports of the case in its earlier stages; how many times the same case is repeated in contemporary reports (an evil which in recent times has grown to such an extent that we have seen no less than seven, and have now in course of publication five, series of contemporary reports in the same courts); and, if you consider farther, how much of unnecessary detail swells the bulk of many old and of almost all recent reports, you will perhaps agree with me in expecting, that all the really useful matter in these 1,100 volumes might be comprised in fewer than one hundred volumes, or in the half of that number if they were closely printed.

"If the precedents so selected and abridged were classified and arranged (any case involving several distinct principles being repeated under each head), every lawyer would be able to reject the volumes devoted to subjects foreign to his studies or practice.

"This much, I think, might be done, without risk and with great advantage, towards digesting the common law. In the operation some useful precedents would possibly be lost or obscured, but they would be few in comparison with the multitude which are now practically lost because they are inaccessible.

"The labour of preparing such a digest would doubtless be very great, but it might be made practicable by division among a moderate number of hands, and extension over a moderate time. A pleader, a chancery barrister, a conveyancer, and a civilian, might form a companionship to whom the task of expurgating and classifying a given number of volumes could safely be intrusted, each of them working upon the whole, in the first instance, independently of the others, stating briefly in the margin his reasons for discarding any case, and then submitting the results to the criticism and correction of his companions. If four lawyers could in this way disposed of thirty volumes in a year, a staff of twenty would complete the work in less than eight years. It should then be printed and be substituted by authority in the place of the old reports, the citation of which in the courts, for any purpose, should thenceforth be forbidden."

AN OLD CASE HUNTER.

The *Birmingham Post* says that Lord Justice Amphlett left Wychbold Hall for town on Thursday to resume his judicial duties at the forthcoming sittings.

The following details, with which we have been favoured, are probably all that will ever be known of the mode in which the Lyskamm accident occurred. The knapsacks of the guides were found at the foot of the *arrête* leading to the summit of the Lyskamm, and various circumstances seem to point to the conclusion that the party were descending from the summit, and had come some distance down the *arrête*, when one or more incautiously stepped on the cornice of snow overhanging one side of the narrow ridge. The cornice was found broken away, and, in proof of its unsafe condition, it is stated that a few days previously, on an ice-axe being thrust into it, a large portion gave way. The belief was current at Zermatt that one of the guides, when he saw his party falling with the cornice, promptly threw himself over the other side of the *arrête*, hoping thus to arrest the fall. The horrible injuries to his body caused by the rope lend probability to this theory; and it is stated that on a previous occasion he had successfully averted a catastrophe by this means.

The political managers in Colorado, says the *Central Law Journal*, have done a sensible thing, and one worthy of general imitation. The chairmen of the central committees of the two political parties in that State agreed that in case any candidate for the office of judge of the Supreme Court should receive the unanimous support of the convention of lawyers which had been called to assemble at Colorado Springs, no party nominations would be made. The lawyers assembled and nominated the Hon. Wilbur F. Stone, of Pueblo.

General Correspondence.

UNCLAIMED DIVIDENDS OF THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Permit me to call the attention of your readers to a parliamentary return presented to the House of Commons during the past session, as I venture to think it contains information of special interest to members of the legal profession.

It seems that during the financial year 1876-7 the Bank of England advanced to the Government from unclaimed dividends no less than (in round numbers) three and a half millions sterling. An examination of similar returns for the last ten years shows that the sums thus yearly advanced vary but slightly. It would therefore appear that the State has the benefit of this enormous amount annually by reason of the representatives of the original holders of these Stocks not being known.

Permit me to suggest that the Bank of England authorities might with great advantage to the public publish a list of the names and addresses of such original holders, and give publicity in every possible way to the fact that such a list is accessible. If this were done there is not the smallest doubt but that these unclaimed dividends would be considerably reduced by legitimate claimants coming forward. If precedents for such publication were wanted they would not be far to seek, and of its value in similar cases there is no doubt whatever, as appears from the report of the Commissioners on Chancery Funds. Speaking of the publication for the first time (in 1856) of a list of the titles of accounts undealt with for fifteen years and upwards, the commissioners say, "Many persons came forward and preferred their claims, and about one-half of the stock supposed to be unclaimed was transferred out of court to successful claimants."

I do not think I can usefully add one word more in support of my suggestion.

EDWARD PRESTON

(Proprietor of "Chambers's Index to Next of Kin," &c.)

Mr. Justice Lopes announced on Thursday last that it has been arranged that a sitting shall be held on the last day of vacation—viz., Wednesday, October 24.

The *Times of India* hears that a despatch has been received by the Government of India from the Secretary of State, in reply to a despatch by the Government of India, setting forth the views of the Government as to the codification of the Indian substantive law, and deprecating the appointment of an Indian Law Commission for the purpose of carrying out the work. The views of the Government of India have been fully explained by the Hon. Mr. Stokes in his speech in Council on the 31st of May last, and with these views the Secretary of State agrees. He also agrees that the legislation contemplated should be carried out by the Legislative Department, which will be strengthened by the addition of a skilled draftsman from England.

The Queen's printers, in issuing the annual volume of public general statutes, give a summary showing that thirty-three of those passed in the session of 1877 related to the whole United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, fourteen related to England, nine to Scotland, seven to Ireland, three to England and Ireland, one to England and Scotland, and two to the colonies. This makes sixty-nine in all. There were also passed last session forty other public statutes, which, being of a local character, chiefly for confirming provisional orders of various departments of the Government, are placed among the local Acts, raising the number of that class of Acts to 342 in the whole. To this must be added eleven private Acts, printed by the Queen's printers, and whereof the printed copies may be given in evidence; and four private Acts not printed. Therefore there were 326 Acts passed in the session.

Societies.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

ANNUAL PROVINCIAL MEETING.

The fourth annual provincial meeting of the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom commenced in Bristol on Wednesday, the assembly being held in the Council-chamber. There was a very large attendance, the room being inconveniently crowded. On the right of the president (Mr. F. F. Burton, of London) were Mr. Clabon and Mr. Dees (vice-presidents), Messrs. Bateson-Wood, Lake, Burns, Follett, and Keen, members of the council of the society; and on the left Mr. Lewis Fry, President of the Bristol Law Society, and Messrs. H. S. Washbrough, C. Bevan, R. Vassall, Prideaux, E. A. Harley, E. M. Harwood, and H. Gribble, members of the council of that society.

The Mayor said he had very much pleasure in welcoming to their ancient city so important a body of gentlemen as the members of the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom, and he hoped that the meeting which they had been kind enough to fix to be held in this ancient city would be as successful as any which they had held hitherto. There was nothing more for him to do than to at once ask their president (Mr. Burton) to take the chair, and he had very much pleasure in introducing him to the meeting.

The President then took the chair, and proceeded to deliver his opening address. After explaining the origin and objects of the provincial meetings of the Incorporated Law Society, and referring to the legislation of last session, he proceeded to consider the Government Bankruptcy Bill of last session. After referring to the figures as to the increase of liquidations, he discussed the provisions of the measure, which he considered to be a sort of compromise between the evils of the former systems, and probably practically as free from objection as any that can be devised. Turning to the Judicature Acts, the president said: We have now passed through the second legal year since the Judicature Act came into operation, and I think it will be interesting to consider, very shortly, what has been the effect of this, by far the most important, statute, as touching the administration of the law, that this generation has seen, and how far it has been a success. After dealing with the evils which the Judicature Act was intended to remedy the president continued: The Judicature Act was, no doubt, a great experiment. Lord Selborne spoke of it as "the greatest measure of law reform that this generation had seen;" and after two years' experience, I think the unanimous verdict of both branches of the law pronounces it a great success. I propose to offer a few observations and to give a few facts and figures in connection with the actual working of the Act, which I think will go far to confirm this verdict, and which I hope will interest you. I should first say, however, that it is obvious that, so far as regards the success of the Act in putting an end to the evils arising from the former conflict of jurisdiction, or from the two separate jurisdictions of the courts of law and equity, the evidence must be of a negative character. It is insufficient to say that since the Act came into operation no such failures of justice, no such scandals as those to which I have referred, have occurred. The actual increase in the amount of business in all the divisions of the High Court which has followed on the Act coming into operation is very remarkable. First, as to the Chancery Division. It appears that the number of suits, informations, special cases, and administration summonses commenced in the Court of Chancery between the years 1864 and 1874 averaged 2,500 a year (the highest number was 2,700, and the lowest 2,300); but for the year 1875—the first year of the Judicature Act coming into operation—the number was 5,111, being more than double the average number. And to show that this increase was not only in the first process, it appears that the average number of orders drawn up in the registrars' office previous to 1875 was about 12,000, but in the year 1875 the number of orders drawn up there was 18,400. In the common law divisions, the effect of this Act has been in the opposite direction, for we find that, in 1874, 22,464 writs were issued out of the Queen's Bench, as against only 19,393 in 1876; that out of the Common Pleas there were issued, in 1874, 17,348 writs, as against only 16,514 in 1876; and that out

of the Exchequer there were issued, in 1874, 29,138 writs, as against only 22,640 in 1876—making in the three courts, a total of 68,950 in 1874 and of only 58,547 in 1876, or a falling off of nearly 10,000 writs in the year. But the reason of this apparent diminution of business is not far to seek, and I need not condole with provincial solicitors in any actual falling off of legal business, for I find that in the year 1876 no less than 30,338 actions were commenced in the district registries, so that, instead of a deficiency, there was, in fact, an excess of upwards of 20,000 actions. It appears, however, that appearances were entered in less than 6,000 of these actions, and we may infer, therefore, that four-fifths of these were mere debt-collecting actions. In one respect a result different to what was anticipated has followed the coming into operation of the Judicature Act. It was expected that a large amount of the lighter class of chancery business turning on questions of fact, where no inquiries were requisite, would gravitate into the common law divisions, but the very opposite result has happened, for I do not find that any action of what was formerly a purely equitable nature has been brought in the common law divisions; and applications for interlocutory injunctions, not founded on a previous establishment of a legal right, have been most rare. On the other hand, however, so large a number of actions, which before the passing of the Judicature Act must have been brought in the common law courts, have been brought in the equity division, that the judges have complained that the block in the chancery division is due to that fact. We may attribute this selection to a growing preference of solicitors to the decision of an educated judge instead of a jury, and to the fact that the objectionable mode of taking evidence, formerly in use on the chancery side, now no longer exists. If we select from the Judicature Act and the rules those provisions that have been more or less completely successful, and which have made the Act a real boon to the suitor, I think we shall find them to be these. Ori. 14, under which a plaintiff in an action on a specially-indorsed writ can obtain judgment after appearance, unless the defendant satisfies the judge there is defence on the merits, has been a remarkable success, and is almost universally acted upon in those cases in which previously defendants gained time by frivolous pleas. The force of a trial of a string of undefended causes now no longer disgraces the courts. The simple forms of pleading now adopted also have answered well, particularly on the common law side. They are, if I may use the expression, more open, and less narrow and technical, and they let in the real facts on both sides, without the constant necessity for amendment. It was thought that this greater freedom of pleading would necessitate the troublesome process of the settlement by the judge of the issues raised for trial; but in practice this has not been found to be the case. The power given to defendants to set off cross claims for damages against liquidated demands, or liquidated demands against damages and cross claims, though not in the same rights or between only the same parties, has been found to work well, and has saved a large amount of litigation, and in many cases has prevented a miscarriage of justice. And so also the power to bring in and add to an action third parties against whom there is a right of relief over, has saved much litigation, and has relieved what I may call middlemen from a position of perplexity and danger; but the recent decision in *Treleven v. Bray* (24 W. R. 198), in which it was held that such third parties were only to be bound by the decision, and that no relief was to be given against them, has, I venture to think, unnecessarily limited the useful operation of the provision. The substitution of the power of transfer of an action from a Common Law to the Chancery Division, for the former system, which compelled a defendant to obtain from the Court of Chancery an injunction to restrain the action at law, has been found completely to answer every purpose. On the question of costs in actions in the common law divisions, there has been much doubt and perplexity, which might have been saved by a little more perspicuity in framing the rules. To deal further with the successful working of the Act, I have only to add that it is generally, I would almost say universally, admitted that the constitution of the Court of Appeal is a complete success, and that that branch of the Supreme Court now gives entire satisfaction. The mixture of judges trained both in the equity and common law courts in the constitution of the court, when sitting on appeal from either division of the courts below, gives to its decisions a breadth and freedom

from the narrow grooves of technicality. Cases from the common law side are decided upon broad principles of justice, tempered by law; and cases from the chancery side are decided according to more certain rules than was apt formerly to be the case. We have a great gain, moreover, in no longer having the anomaly of a Lord Chancellor sitting alone, to overrule the decisions of a judge or judges equal, or sometimes superior, in mental power to himself. In the observations I have hitherto made I have looked upon the Act as a success. Happily, I think there is but little to be said on the other side of the question. It was not to be expected that, in bringing into operation a great change in the whole system of judicature of this country, which it had been the work of centuries to build up, the new machine would, at first starting, have worked smoothly, and accordingly there has been much difficulty in arranging the judicial work on the common law side, more particularly as regards the trial of causes both in London and on circuit, and much inconvenience has been the result. The attempt to introduce the system of making all applications before the single judge who had tried an action, under the Act and Rules of 1876, is still upon its trial, and as yet does not work well. But we may fairly hope that all this will in good time be cured. The provisions in the Act on the whole subject of the mode of trial work badly, and imperatively require amendment. The power in the judges to direct the mode of trial best suited to any particular case is still too limited; and the necessity that still exists for the parties in litigation to resort at great cost to a tribunal of their own selection, in the shape of an arbitrator, is still as crying an evil as ever. We still have enacted, almost as frequently as before the passing of the Judicature Act, what I would call the farce, but what is too often a painful tragedy to the parties concerned, of an action being brought, at enormous cost for counsel and witnesses, into court, only to be opened, and then referred. The mode of disposing, by a judge and jury, of the simple questions that arose between our forefathers is quite inadequate to meet the exigencies of the large and complicated transactions of the present day, and what is imperatively required is a satisfactory tribunal for the disposal of such cases as are unsuited for trial before a judge or jury, and an absolute power in the court—unhindered by old-fashioned notions about the right of trial by jury—to send such case before such tribunal. But the great failure of the Judicature Act lies in the official referees. It is a difficult and somewhat delicate question to discuss, but the fact is that the four gentlemen appointed for this office are not popular either with the bar or solicitors, and they are, comparatively speaking, unemployed, while barristers are as much engaged on arbitrations as ever. It appears from an official return that the four official referees last year sat 904 hours, or upon an average only three-quarters of an hour a day each, and that the total amount awarded by them was under £17,000. Their cost to the country for salaries alone was £6,000. We may form a guess at the proportion of business that goes to arbitration in the common law divisions from this. A friend of mine, a common law Queen's Counsel in good practice, has made a calculation of the proportion of his time occupied in arbitration, and he finds that during the last two years and a half one-fifth of his whole time has been so occupied. As matters now stand, if a cause be long, complicated, and difficult—and such causes are generally the most important—and if it be on the common law side, it is next to certain that it will not be tried by a judge or jury, but will be referred to a barrister; while if the cause be in the Chancery Division it is equally certain that, however long, complicated, or difficult it may be, it will sooner or later be disposed of by the judge himself. This is a state of things that ought not to be, and it is no doubt one of the causes that has led to that increasing disposition on the part of suitors (of which Mr. Osborne Morgan bears witness) to prefer the Chancery to the common law divisions. However complicated and difficult a suitor's cause may be, he has as great a right to have it decided by a judge, or by an officer of the weight and position of a judge, in the common law divisions, as if it were in the Chancery Division. There is one further subject to which I must allude before I conclude my observations on the Judicature Act. I have shown you how large and important an amount of business is done before the district registrars. There is a growing feeling that the gentlemen holding these offices should no

be allowed to practise, and that, among other objections, they acquire an amount of information as to people's affairs which operates unfairly both on the public and on other solicitors. I dare say that this inconvenience does arise, but I would caution solicitors against raising an agitation on this question, for if the office be accompanied by a restriction against practising, the next step will inevitably be that it will be thrown open to barristers of five years' standing. Gentlemen, we are living in a period of great enlightenment, and, as a natural consequence, of great change. Nothing is now taken for granted. Nothing is accepted without question simply because our fathers accepted it. Every institution is on its trial. As a modern writer has recently said:—"Every belief that life was once supposed to rest upon we see men calmly questioning and preparing to cast aside. Doctrines are swinging before us in the balance that seemed but yesterday to be as fixed as mountains. There is, in fact, a greater intellectual struggle now going on about us than the world in its whole history has ever before witnessed." But in nothing in this country has a greater change taken place than in the spirit in which the laws have been administered. Unless a suitor has merits and justice on his side, he cannot now hope to win, and a solicitor can no longer serve his client's interest by bringing into operation, what I will call, the mere chicanery of the law. A great revolution has been for years quietly working its way in the minds of the educated and liberal-minded judges and lawyers of the present day, which has found its climax and expression in the Judicature Act. Let us, whose most honourable profession it is to assist in the administration of the law, take care that we maintain a leading place in the great race that is going on. Let it be our boast that our profession is second to none in education, in high tone, in honour, in independence, and in a liberal and enlightened readiness to welcome every sound and well-considered improvement in our laws. And let us hope that it shall always be the first care of the Incorporated Law Society, and of the Bristol Law Society, and of the other provincial law societies, and, I will add, of these meetings, to see that our profession keeps pace with the progress of the day, and maintains a high position in this enlightened age in which it is our good fortune to live.

The address throughout was received with repeated marks of approval, and on resuming his seat the president was greeted with loud cheers.

Mr. DIGGLES, President of the Manchester Law Society, tendered the council an invitation to hold the next provincial meeting in that city, and a brief discussion ensued, some gentlemen urging that it was undesirable to hold all their meetings in large commercial centres, but that they should sometimes go to smaller towns. The selection of the next place of meeting was left to the council.

Mr. COLBORN, commenting upon the president's observations upon the Judicature Act, said that so far as his experience went there was no ground for congratulating their clients upon the economy of the general working of the Judicature Act, for he could not see that there had been any saving of expense, and the only persons who appeared to have profited were the printers.

PARLIAMENTARY AGENCY.

Mr. J. M. CLARON, of London, read a paper on "Parliamentary Agency," in which he expressed his approval of the recommendations of the joint-committee, except that no one ought to be admitted as an agent who is not a barrister, advocate, solicitor, or writer to the signet.

Mr. BLYTH (London), who read a paper on the subject at the Oxford meeting last year, contended that parliamentary agency required primarily a thorough knowledge of the law, and that lawyers only ought to be admitted to practise as parliamentary agents.

BANKRUPTCY.

Mr. BATESON-WOOD (Manchester) read a paper on "Bankruptcy," in which he urged that the objects of bankruptcy legislation should be—1st, to secure to creditors immediate and entire control of the debtor's property; 2ndly, to give some legal authority to decide disputes; 3rdly, to leave trustees unfettered by any court, unless interference was sought by the creditors; and, 4thly, to grant the debtor his discharge on giving up his property, unless circumstances disentitled him to it. He believed that the first and third of those propositions were better met by the deed of arrangement abolished by the Act of 1869 than by the provisions of

that Act, and he was in favour of the law being made stringent against those who went on trading when they were aware of their inability to meet their engagements. He also dwelt upon the power placed in the hands of fraudulent debtors by the Bills of Sale Act, and the ability to mortgage trade fixtures.

An adjournment was now taken for luncheon, which was provided in the Law Library and the Grand Jury room, Guildhall. On re-assembling,

Mr. GILL (Liverpool), commenting upon the paper read by Mr. Bateson-Wood, said that, as a class, solicitors were threatened with almost entire extinction by the Bankruptcy Bill of last session, and, therefore, the subject was one demanding serious consideration. He was of opinion that the grand basis upon which a Bill should be founded was the consideration of the creditors, and not of the debtor, and not upon what were the views of Chambers of Commerce, who affected to rule legislation. He agreed with the old law, which enacted that it was for the court to determine whether a man ought to have his discharge or not, and not for the creditors. That was a question of Imperial policy, for it was the worst possible thing to have 40,000 or 50,000 undischarged bankrupts, not knowing whether their estate was in them, the first or the second trustee, or the registrar. The question of the discharge of a bankrupt should be entirely separated from that of misconduct, and misconduct in the bankrupt should be dealt with by its proper tribunal, quite apart from the creditors and quite apart from the question of discharge. They should not let it be a question whether the creditors had sufficient funds to prosecute, neither should the assets of the estate be wasted for the purpose, but if a man had committed a crime, or had offended in any way against the bankruptcy law, the state should meet him as a criminal, and prosecute him just as it would if he had stolen a handkerchief. The great objection to the Bill of last session was the enormous increase of expense in the management of estates which it would introduce. They, as a profession, repudiated the charges in the report of Mr. Mansfield Parkyn, on which he believed the Bill of last session was founded, for, instead of being overpaid for the work they did under the Bankruptcy Act, they were very much underpaid. The rates at which they were paid, and the manner in which their costs were taxed in most of the district registries, made the work of a solicitor in bankruptcy wholly unremunerative, and, if unconnected with other business, was such as he would not undertake—in point of fact, he never was contented with taxed costs in bankruptcy, and hardly any professional men of standing in Liverpool would act in bankruptcy unless they were paid their ordinary charges irrespective of taxation, and any attempt to make the charges less remunerative would remove the work from their hands to men of a lower class, or to a Government office. The proposal in the Bill was an attempt to introduce officialism in a far worse degree than it was ever introduced, and if there was an attempt to re-introduce it in the coming session, they ought to insist upon their rights and privileges.

Mr. MANLEY (Sheffield) remarked that some lawyers in his town were in the habit of allowing one-fourth or one-half of the net profits derived from a bankruptcy to the accountants, and he hoped that such a transaction would be forbidden in any future Bill.

Mr. MILLER (Bristol) observed that many of the great blots in bankruptcy practice did not require an Act of Parliament to amend them, but might be rectified by an amendment of the rules and orders, which were made by two persons and could be altered without going to Parliament. He entirely agreed with the remarks of Mr. Gill upon the unmerited, unworthy, and uncalled-for slur sought to be cast upon the profession by Mr. Mansfield Parkyns, the late official assignee in bankruptcy at Exeter, and now Comptroller of Bankruptcy in London.

Mr. SANDERS (Birmingham) was in favour of the Lord Chancellor's Bill, with certain modifications.

PROFESSIONAL REMUNERATION.

Mr. R. L. J. VANSALL (Bristol) read a paper on "Professional Remuneration," remarking that as they were aware the relation between solicitor and client with reference to the remuneration of the former by the latter was of an exceptional character. Instead of being left as in the case of all other professions to bargain or custom, with an appeal in extreme cases to a jury, it was governed by the Act of 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, under which no solicitor could recover his charge

without having one month previously delivered a signed bill, which bill was liable to taxation by officers appointed for the purpose, who considered themselves bound by the scale of allowances settled in past ages, when the value of money was much greater, and when the technicalities of conveyancing were much more cumbrous than at present. That provision, therefore, necessitated the setting out in the bill of all the details making up the total of the charges, and, as the length of the documents was the gauge of remuneration for preparing them, the high-minded practitioner who, with great trouble and by the exercise of superior skill and legal knowledge, simplified and condensed the documents he prepared, instead of receiving adequate remuneration, must be content with a fraction of what was charged by the lazy, clumsy, or greedy practitioner who directed his clerk to copy out pages of recitals and the longest set of printed precedents. That evil had been long and generally felt. The payment of solicitors according to the length of documents and the intricacy in matters of detail and technicality of the business transacted by them tended directly to interfere with the improvement and simplification of the law and practice of conveyancing. It was desirable, in the interests of the public, that the amount to be paid to a solicitor for his services should not only be certain and easily ascertained, but that it should also be regulated by the money value of the transaction. In conveyancing, the paper advocated the adoption of a graduated scale of charges by commission, remarking that it was to be assumed that a man, when considering for what price he should buy or sell land, or whether he should mortgage it, would be glad to know with certainty how much he would have to pay his solicitor, and that end would be secured by the fixing and authorization of a scale of *ad valorem* charges. After remarking that he considered the Solicitors Act (33 & 34 Vict. c. 28)—the 4th section of which enabled a solicitor and client to enter into an agreement in writing for the remuneration of the former for work done or to be done—was wrong in principle and insufficient in its provisions, and that any such bargaining was derogatory, he said a solicitor had a right to be placed in the position of being intrusted with the work necessary to be done, without having as a first step to bargain what he was to be paid for it. Payment on a fair and reasonable scale ought to follow as a necessary consequence of his employment. Reference was then made to the efforts of the Incorporated Law Society and other societies to remedy the existing evil by the adoption of an *ad valorem* scale, and since the passing of the Solicitors Act of 1870, and he thought in consequence of the passing of that Act, several scales of charges had been issued, the last being the most comprehensive of the whole. The scales had in many cases enabled them to receive payment of a lump sum proportioned to the value of the transaction and the consequent responsibility attaching to it, and that had been done to the mutual satisfaction of both solicitor and client. But that only encouraged them to proceed further in the matter, and to get rid of the objectionable fact that at present there was greater uncertainty as to the amount to be charged for work than had ever before existed. It was neither the desire nor the interest of the profession to receive other than fair remuneration sufficient to enable them to maintain the position of gentlemen, and to place them beyond the temptation of increasing their income by multiplying charges or fostering litigation; and, on the other hand, it was neither the wish nor the interest of the public that less than a fair scale should be fixed, as they were alive to the necessity that existed of the persons absolutely trusted by them on buying and selling and making settlements of property, and in all complicated transactions, being gentlemen of education, animated by a high sense of honour, and relieved of any temptation to increase their income by the means suggested. It seemed to him that it would be desirable to strengthen the hands of the council of that society by passing a resolution in favour of obtaining authoritative sanction of a scale of legal charges by way of commission, to be made as comprehensive as possible, for all transactions that have to be carried out by deed, and that the public should be interested in the matter by its being shown to them that the removal of the restrictions under which solicitors were now placed with reference to charges for non-contentious business, and the substitution of a fixed and reasonable scale of charges proportioned to the extent in value of each particular transaction, would be a step in the

right direction, and would work for their benefit as well as for that of the profession.

Mr. PAYNE (Liverpool) having briefly expressed his approval of the proposals suggested in the paper,

Mr. PETGRAVE (Bath) observed that the question was one of very great importance, and also of very great difficulty. He was of opinion that a scale would never be sanctioned, for when the purchase-money or the amount of a mortgage went beyond a certain sum they would never get their professional charges allowed. In sales averaging from £2,000 to £5,000 they might obtain them, but beyond that amount there would, he believed, be very great difficulty.

The PRESIDENT remarked that the council had urged it upon the Solicitor-General by letter and by personal interview within the last few months, and all the assurance they could get was that it should be done.

After some further discussion,

Mr. J. COX (Bristol) moved the following resolution:—"That the present legalized system of charging for non-contentious business was unsatisfactory both to the public and the profession, that for some time past a scale had been partially in operation, to the great satisfaction of all parties, and that, whilst the thanks of the profession are due to the council for the efforts made to obtain an authorized scale of charges, this meeting is firmly of opinion that a further effort should be made for this object."

Mr. LAKE (London) seconded the motion.

Mr. INSKIP (Bristol) thought they were specially indebted to Mr. Vassall for the tone in which he had introduced that subject. He had by his paper reflected great credit on their profession, and raised the discussion of the question of costs out of the low level into which there was a tendency to let it fall. He thought they should confine themselves to approving the principles rather than discussing details, and believed they would all unanimously support the resolution. He doubted whether the scale of charges submitted by the council had given universal satisfaction, but he thought they might safely leave the matter to the Solicitor-General, who, having been at the bar, could recognize the right of being fairly remunerated for services.

The resolution was adopted *nem. con.*

CONSOLIDATION.

A paper on "Consolidation" was read by Mr. GRINHAM KEEN, of Doctors'-commons, and in reference to a suggestion contained in it, the following resolution was, upon the proposition of Mr. MILLER, of Bristol, adopted:—"That it be a suggestion of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society that at a fitting time they should endeavour to bring about an alteration of the law in the direction of providing that all solicitors of ten years' standing should be eligible to be appointed to act as notaries."

This concluded the business of the day, and in the evening Mr. Lewis Fry, President of the Bristol Law Society, entertained a large company at dinner at the hall of the Society of Merchant Venturers.

The meetings were resumed on Thursday morning, the president (Mr. E. F. Burton) in the chair. There was again a numerous attendance.

Mr. COLBORN (Monmouth) moved the following resolution:—"That, in order to turn the annual provincial meetings of the society to more practical purposes, it is desirable that a course of procedure should be adopted, whereby the members present may be informed beforehand of the questions for discussion, and every facility given for the greatest possible number of members taking part in it; and that the Council of the Incorporated Law Society be requested to settle such a course of procedure, so that it might be in operation at the next meeting."

Mr. WILKIN (Wakefield) seconded the motion, which was carried with but one dissentient, the president promising that it should receive the consideration of the council, but remarking that it was only on Friday last that the council was in a position to send out a list of papers to be read, and that list would not have been at all a satisfactory one.

NOTES ON THE SOLICITORS ACT.

Mr. B. G. LAKE (London) read a paper with this title, which we hope to print in full.

The PRESIDENT remarked that, before entering upon a discussion of Mr. Lake's paper, the next paper upon the list, as it bore upon the same subject, should be read.

ARTICLES OF CLERKSHIP.

Mr. C. W. LAWRENCE (Cirencester) then read his paper upon this subject, which we also hope to print in full.

Mr. CLABON (London) expressed a hope that they would never go to barristers to conduct their examinations. He hoped, too, that they would not resort to paid examiners, but keep the honour of conducting those examinations in their own hands.

Mr. FOLLETT (Exeter) also spoke in favour of the examinations being continued in the hands of the council of that society.

Mr. DODD (London) moved the following resolution:—"That, in the opinion of this meeting, in no case should the preliminary examination be dispensed with, except where some examination of a higher scholastic character shall have been passed by the candidate; and the council be respectfully requested to strongly urge this on the attention of the judges." The speaker expressed his objection to men being admitted to the profession whose only qualification was ten years' service in a solicitor's office; and, referring to the facility with which the preliminary and intermediate examinations were sometimes passed, mentioned an instance in which an omnibus conductor passed those examinations. He thought it unfair that the ten years' men should be thrust upon them, when no such thing existed in any other learned profession.

Mr. MORGAN (Birmingham) observed that they had had many instances of men being added to their ranks who had not brought lustre to their profession, and he thought it a duty cast upon them to endeavour to maintain a higher scholastic tone in their examinations.

Mr. MILLER (Bristol) said that memorials to the judges for exemption from the preliminary examinations by ten years' men became so frequent that the Bristol Law Society passed a resolution that no member should sign such memorial without a previous expression of opinion by the committee of that society. These memorials were always addressed to the same judge, as he was known to deal with such applications in a more lenient spirit than the other members of the bench.

Mr. BARBER (Brighouse) urged that they should take care to raise their standard as much as possible so that they might continue to maintain their position as one of the learned professions. Their desire should be, not to add pettifogging attorneys to their ranks, but gentlemen.

Mr. SANDERS (Birmingham) argued in favour of raising the standard of the preliminary examinations, for a low standard had been one of the doors to the injury of the profession.

In the course of a desultory discussion which ensued, it was agreed, with the consent of the mover and seconder, that the following words should be incorporated in Mr. Dodd's resolution:—"That in the opinion of this meeting candidates at the preliminary examinations should be requested to take Latin as one of the two languages in which to be examined," and the amended resolution was unanimously adopted.

Mr. LAKE (London) moved—"That this meeting, while desiring that examinations should continue to be conducted by members of the council, is of opinion that if this be found impracticable they should be conducted by solicitors."

Mr. FOLLETT (Exeter) seconded the motion.

Mr. LAWRENCE (Cirencester) moved the previous question.

Mr. FRANCIS (Cambridge) seconded the proposition.

After a discussion, the motion of Mr. Lake, which was somewhat modified in the course of debate, was carried by a majority.

Mr. COLBORN (Monmouth) moved—"That this meeting does not recommend that the term of service under articles be shortened."

Mr. BURNE (Bath) seconded the proposition.

Mr. LAWIE FRY (Bristol) thought it inexpedient to express an opinion, either one side or the other, on so important a question, and remarked that his sympathies were very much with the views expressed by Mr. Lawrence in his paper.

After a brief discussion, the motion was withdrawn.

PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. FOLLETT (Exeter) read a paper on this matter, which dealt with the question of appointments, peculiarly fitted and intended for solicitors, being bestowed elsewhere, and an injury thus done to the profession. He pointed out that their work was of a highly responsible character; that, as at present adjusted, society could not do without it; that the trust reposed in them by their clients individually was almost unbounded: that the power they possessed for good or evil was immense; and was it just or good for the public to remove from it all public recognition of confidence and to relegate it only to the contemplation of its own pecuniary advantages? He observed that many appointments which should have been held by solicitors were held by barristers, but there was no single instance in which a solicitor had been promoted to an appointment which properly belonged to a barrister.

Mr. GRINHAM KEEN (London) expressed his high approval of the paper read by Mr. Follett, and referred to three appointments which had been recently made—one in the India Office, another in the Office of Woods and Forests, and the third was an appointment of Queen's Proctor. The appointment in the Woods and Forests Office was made by the present Government.

Mr. A. COX (Bristol) moved—"That this meeting is strongly of opinion that the occupation of posts of honour, peculiarly fitted to gentlemen who have had a solicitor's training, by members of the bar is not only injurious to the solicitors of England, but also to the public."

Mr. WILKIN (Wakefield) seconded the motion, and observed that four of the best appointments in his town were held by neither barrister nor solicitor.

PUBLIC PROSECUTORS.

Mr. W. SMITH (Sheffield) read a paper on this subject, in which he combated the generally expressed opinion of the necessity of a public prosecutor, remarking that the police would still have to discharge the duties, and he failed to see that they would do it better under a public prosecutor than as at present under the police superintendents. By the Treasury rendering help in special and difficult cases, and by more liberal treatment of solicitors, prosecutors, and witnesses in cases of ordinary occurrence, the reluctance to prosecute criminals now existing would cease. He also pointed out that the cost of appointing public prosecutors throughout the land would be very great.

Mr. LAKE (London) disapproved altogether of the views held by the reader of the paper, and held that in the appointment of a public prosecutor there would be a guarantee that no matter of criminal import would be stifled or compromised.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE (Bristol), speaking from fifteen years' experience as clerk to a bench of magistrates, bore testimony to the evils which in his opinion arose from there not being a public prosecutor.

Mr. PARKINSON (Bristol) observed that there was no gentleman who could speak with greater authority upon that matter than the last speaker; who, in addition to being clerk to a bench of magistrates in that neighbourhood, also held the position of public prosecutor in this city. He was of opinion that a public prosecutor was greatly needed, and he referred to the anomalous position of a magistrate's clerk; first advising the police in getting up a case, and afterwards advising lay magistrates in adjudicating upon the same case. In Bristol up to the time of a committal for trial there was no one responsible, but at that period the last speaker stepped in as a public prosecutor.

Mr. HOLTRY (York) was strongly opposed to the appointment of a public prosecutor, believing that the work would not be better done than at present.

Mr. PAYNE (Bath) did not think that a public prosecutor was needed.

Mr. PAYNE (Liverpool) expressed his approval of the appointment of the public prosecutors.

Mr. TRENCHARD (Taunton) considered that justice was substantially done by the present system, and did not see the need of a public prosecutor, the appointment of whom would not in his opinion prevent the settlement of cases before the time of trial arrived.

Mr. H. I. BROWN (Bristol) expressed himself in favour of the appointment of a public prosecutor.

THE JUDICATURE ACT.

Mr. PARKINSON (Bristol) read a paper on the operation and practical working of the Judicature Acts in Bristol, with suggestions for the amendment and improvement of the practice in district registries, and the consequent relief of London chamber business. The paper detailed at some length the working of the Act in Bristol, and made the following suggestions, having for their object the double view of the amendment of the practice in district registries, and the relief of the lamentably overcrowded judges' chambers in London:—First, abolish the useless restriction of jurisdiction of the district registrars (except by consent) in applications for discovery and inspection; second, in applications relating to the awarding of costs; and third, let the first judgment summons be issued and heard by the district registrar, and let him fix the amount of instalments and date of payments, but without power of committal. He expressed his decided and firm conviction that the country practitioner and the suitor alike had been immensely benefited by the operation and effect of the Judicature Act.

Mr. GILL (Liverpool) expressed his opinion that the Judicature Act was a great improvement and a wonderful reform.

The PRESIDENT moved—"That the thanks of this meeting be given to the Bristol Incorporated Law Society for their cordial reception of the members of the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom and other members of the profession to whom their kind invitation was extended, and also for their liberal hospitality during the continuance of the meeting."

Mr. LAWRENCE (Cirencester) seconded the motion, which was carried *nem. con.*

Votes of thanks were carried to the reception committee, and to the hon. secretary, Mr. Lawes; to the mayor for granting the use of the Council-chamber for their meetings, and for his distinguished hospitality to many of them.

On the motion of Mr. LEWIS FRY thanks were voted to the authors of the papers read to the meeting; to the Master and the Society of Merchant Venturers for having granted the use of their hall for the dinner; and to the town clerk and treasurer of the corporation of Bristol, for affording the members of the society an opportunity of inspecting the ancient charters and records of the city of Bristol, and their courteous attention in explaining them.

Mr. MORRELL (Oxford) moved a vote of thanks to the president for the very able way in which he had addressed them, and for the great cordiality, courtesy, and impartiality with which he had occupied the chair.

Mr. A. COX (Bristol) seconded the motion, which was carried by acclamation.

The PRESIDENT briefly acknowledged the compliment, and said he should always entertain a most grateful recollection of the kind reception accorded to him at Bristol.

The meeting of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association was held on Thursday. We shall report it next week.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

This society resumed its ordinary meetings on Wednesday, the 10th inst., at Clement's-inn Hall, Strand, Mr. E. C. Rawlings in the chair. The secretary presented his report of the condition of the society and its progress during the past six months. On the motion of Mr. W. Shirley Shirley, B.A., a resolution was passed that at the last meeting in every month at Clement's-inn Hall, members of the Hardwicke, Law Students' Debating, Westminster, and Union Societies, and also the Union Societies of Oxford and Cambridge should be permitted without invitation or introduction to be present, and to take part in the debate in the same manner in all respects as members of the society. The meeting, after disposing of several other business questions, adjourned at a late hour.

Appointments, &c.

Mr. WILLIAM JAMESON SOULSBY, barrister, has been again appointed Private Secretary to the Lord Mayor for the ensuing year.

Mr. ALEXANDER NEILL, solicitor, of Bradford, has been elected Clerk of the Peace for that borough. Mr. Neill was admitted a solicitor in 1871.

Mr. THOMAS SENIOR, solicitor (of the firm of Senior & Wilson), of Bradford, has been elected Coroner for that borough. Mr. Senior was admitted a solicitor in 1840.

Mr. FRANK M'GOWEN, solicitor, of Bradford, has been appointed Prosecuting Solicitor for that borough. Mr. M'Gowen is the son of Mr. William Thomas M'Gowen, solicitor, town clerk of Bradford, and was admitted in 1876.

Mr. CHARLES AGNEW TURNER, barrister, has been appointed Official Assignee of the Court for the Relief of Insolvent Debtors at Bombay. Mr. Turner was educated at Trinity College, Oxford, where he graduated third class in law and modern history in 1872. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1873, and practised for a short time on the Home Circuit.

Legal News.

Trade Marks says that the German Imperial Patent Office has issued the following notification, dated September 16, 1877:—"In case of application, in accordance with the Patent Law of May 25, 1877, for granting a patent for an invention, which is protected by a patent in virtue of the laws of the country of the patentee, the applicant has to produce such original patent to the Imperial Patent Office. If the original owner of the patent has ceded his rights in the same to another person, the latter, in applying for the granting of a patent according to the above-mentioned law, has to submit, besides the original patent, also the instrument testifying to the transfer. This latter will be only considered valid if it is authenticated judicially, or by notary, or by an Imperial consul."

The bar of New Zealand have recently presented an address to the resident judges of the Supreme Court with reference to a petition presented to Parliament by Mr. Barton, containing charges against two of the judges. The following are the terms of the address, which was read by Mr. Brandon on behalf of the bar:—"May it please your honours,—The members of the bar practising in the Supreme Court at this place, with an obvious exception, have requested me to state in open court that they have noticed with regret that a gentleman practising at the bar here has made an application to Parliament containing charges against two of the judges of this honourable court. They desire that it should be known that this application has been made without previous consultation with any of them; that they are ignorant of its statements, except from common rumour, and have no sympathy with such a proceeding. They make this statement, not merely to show their respect for the judges of this court—for no demonstration of the kind is needed—but in order to protect the public from being misled by silence on the part of the bar under circumstances so unprecedented in their character." The Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Richmond replied. "Both judges," says the local journal, "spoke obviously under the influence of deep feeling, the Chief Justice especially, who at first appeared almost overcome by strong emotion. The members of the bar then bowed and retired, and an unusual scene terminated."

At Bow-street on Tuesday Alfred Thomas Wilson was again charged on remand, before Mr. Vaughan, with having in his possession a St. Louis and Iron Mountain Railway bond which had been stolen from the Swiss mail near Zurich. Mr. Greene, instructed by the Swiss Consulate, prosecuted, and Mr. St. John Wontner appeared on behalf of the prisoner. The facts of the case had been fully gone into at previous examinations, and the prisoner had been remanded to afford Mr. Wontner an opportunity of pro-

ducing evidence to prove that he was a British subject, and not an American, as he alleged at the time of his arrest. His brother and other relatives were called, and they proved beyond doubt that the prisoner was born in London. The register of his birth and certificate of his father's marriage to his mother had been obtained from Somerset House, and the former was put in evidence. Mr. Vaughan said that in the absence of evidence to the contrary the documents certainly seemed to establish a *prima facie* case that the prisoner was English born. Mr. Wontner said that, having produced sufficient evidence to show that the prisoner was a subject of this country, it was impossible for the Government to grant his extradition to Switzerland. If his worship thought, the treaty notwithstanding, that the English Government might, in the comity of nations, surrender the prisoner, it was of no use his arguing any further, and he must apply elsewhere. After an elaborate review of various sections of the Extradition Treaty with Switzerland, Mr. Vaughan said that he would remand the prisoner for fifteen days to the House of Detention, at the expiration of which time he would be surrendered unless the application to be made in another quarter should nullify that order.

A NEW DEVELOPMENT OF CONTEMPT OF COURT.

THE *Cumberland and Westmoreland Advertiser* records the following scene at the court for the revision of the list of voters for the Eastern Division of the county of Cumberland, held in Carlisle on Tuesday week, Mr. Faulkner Blair being the revising barrister. Mr. Bendle, solicitor (ex-mayor of Carlisle), appeared to sustain the objections and claims of the Liberals, and Mr. Wannop and Mr. Johnson to sustain those of the Conservatives.

An objection was raised by the Conservatives against the vote of Mr. Thomas Scott, who occupies and is the owner of freehold premises at Kingstown. Scott, on being called, said that he was the owner of the premises in question, which would let for £7 10s. a year. In cross-examination by Mr. Wannop, he stated that he occupied the whole of the property, and there was no portion of it in such a dilapidated condition that it could not be occupied. The only incumbrance he had on it was £70.—Mr. Bendle said he would call independent evidence of the value of the property. Scott had had £7 10s. a year rental offered for it.—The Revising Barrister said he would not admit evidence of an offer having been made. He might have been a lunatic who made it.—Mr. John Scott, Kingstown, was called, and in answer to a question as to value said he had himself offered £7 a year for the house.—Did you not hear me say I would not admit evidence of an offer?—Witness: I did not.—The Revising Barrister: Then I will not believe a word you say about it.—Mr. Bendle: The witness says he did not hear you.—The Revising Barrister: Then he must confine himself to answering questions that are put.—Mr. Scott said that according to the value of other property at Kingstown the house in question was worth £7 10s. a year.—The Revising Barrister said he was not content with the amount, and would strike off the claimant. It was obvious that the property was of a very rubbishy character.—Mr. Bendle: I don't think that is a justifiable remark, there is nothing in the evidence to support it.—The Revising Barrister: Now, Mr. Bendle, I will not allow any gentleman to dispute a decision that I give.—Mr. Bendle: I do not dispute your decision. I only say that the remark is not justified by the evidence.—The Revising Barrister: You have no right to speak after I have given my decision. You shall never make a remark, nor shall any other gentleman, after I have given my decision. If you interrupt the business of the court, I shall order the officer to put you out.—Mr. Bendle: I beg your pardon, sir; I have a perfect right to be here.—The Revising Barrister (to the two officers in attendance and pointing to Mr. Bendle): If that gentleman makes another remark put him out.—Mr. Bendle: No they will not. They know me too well for that.—The Revising Barrister: Turn him out of the court. [The policemen heard the order, but made no movement towards obeying it.]—Mr. Bendle: I have practised in this court for nearly thirty years, and my conduct has never been complained of. I have practised before Lord Justice Brett and all the other barristers who have presided during that

period, and this is the first time that my conduct has been challenged.—The Revising Barrister: I have no doubt, Mr. Bendle, that what you said was a slip, and that you did not know you were making a remark on a decision that had been given. I am quite certain that if you had thought for one moment that you were making a remark of that nature you would not have made it.—Mr. Bendle: I wish to treat you with respect, but at the same time I claim a right to address myself to the cases.—The Revising Barrister: Then you must speak before I give my decision in other cases.—Mr. Bendle: You made an observation in the case on which no evidence had been given.—The Revising Barrister: I had the evidence of the overseer.—Mr. Bendle: I did not hear the overseer say it.—The Revising Barrister: I asked you to cross-examine the overseer yourself.—Mr. Bendle: I did not choose to do so.—The subject then dropped, and the business of the court was proceeded with.

JUDGES' CHAMBERS.

"A SOLICITOR'S CLERK" writes to the *Standard* on October 9:—"There has, in addition to the vacation master, been one judge in attendance there to-day. His lordship, who arrived about half-past eleven, had a list of eleven adjournments from Tuesday and twenty-six from Friday last, in addition to a long list of new cases for to-day. This might be called an off-day, in consequence of the absence of the 'legal practitioners' pest' which (since the Abolition of Arrest for Debt Act) summonses against judgment or impecunious debtors have become; but notwithstanding the absence of the judgment debtor summonses, his lordship, up to the time of hearing counsel (two p.m.), had only disposed of the adjournments. Many practitioners and managing clerks have wasted the whole of to-day—possibly upon one summons only—for which they will be entitled to charge their respective clients 3s. 4d., and must attend again to-morrow, which is specially fixed for disposing of to-day's arrears. But this is not all—the judges' clerks have been so much worried by the repeated applications of parties anxious to ascertain the position of their case in the list that they now almost turn a deaf ear to inquiries upon the subject, so that it is not safe (for however important a matter) to leave the chambers, otherwise your case may be called on and passed over; even when the case is called, the noise and confusion render inaudible the mild voice of his lordship's clerk. I have had twenty years' experience of Judges' Chambers and never knew them to be in such a disgraceful state as now. When there were three judges daily and before judgment debtor summonses were introduced, we used to get our work through in a very short time. It may be said there are now three masters in attendance, in addition to a judge, but in reply I have only to say that in the majority of cases the masters' decisions are appealed against (very often successfully), and, consequently, many applications are heard twice. My suggestion is that there should be two judges at least in daily attendance, and that the rotation masters should remain daily at Judges' Chambers until four p.m.; that the list system now adopted should be continued—of course publicly posting one or two copies of it, and that an official having a voice to be heard should be appointed to each division to assist the judge's or master's clerk in ushering the respective parties before the judge. Mere simple matters of practice, such as extension of time, should be left to the chamber clerks of the judges. Imagine the absurdity of two clerks squabbling before a master as to whether an extension of time should be seven or ten days."

Another "Solicitor's Clerk" writes to the *Daily Telegraph* of Thursday:—"It was my misfortune to attend an appeal summons this (Wednesday) morning. The summons, like all the rest, was returnable at eleven o'clock, and was handed in by me to the judge's clerk about ten minutes past. After waiting nearly an hour with my opponent, we were informed the judge had just arrived. Thereupon his clerk came out again, presumably to summon those who were waiting. No such luck. He produced two lists—last Tuesday's and Friday's. As these had to be disposed of before the summonses of the day, and the judge had intimated he would also take *ex parte* applications at once, the chances of our being heard grew very limited. After waiting two hours more, my opponent thought, as I did, that we had

wasted enough time for 3s. 4d.; indeed, in agency case this meagre sum is cut down to 1s. 8d.; and this is the charge allowed us for wasting the best part of the day. We therefore, adjourned the summons until Friday next, when it will in all probability go over again until the following Tuesday." Another "Solicitor's Clerk" writes: "I have had twenty years' experience of Judges' Chambers, and never knew them to be in such a disgraceful state as now."

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

Oct. 12, 1877.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 3 per Cent. Consols, 95½ | Annuities, April, '88, 91 |
| Do. to Account, Nov. 2, 95½ | Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1868 |
| Do. 3 per Cent. Reduced, 94½ x d | Ex Billa, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 2 pm |
| New 2 per Cent., 94½ x d | Ditto, £500, Do. 2 pm. |
| Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94 | Ditto, £100 & £200, 2 pm. |
| Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94 | Bank of England Stock.—per |
| Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '78 | Ct. (last half-year), 262 |
| Annuities, Jan. '80 | Ditto for Account. |

RAILWAY STOCK.

| | Railways. | Paid. | Closing Prices |
|-------|---|-------|----------------|
| Stock | Bristol and Exeter | 100 | — |
| Stock | Caledonian | 100 | 122 |
| Stock | Glasgow and South-Western | 100 | 108 |
| Stock | Great Eastern Ordinary Stock | 100 | 47 |
| Stock | Great Northern | 100 | 115 |
| Stock | Do., A Stock | 100 | 112½ |
| Stock | Great Southern and Western of Ireland | 100 | — |
| Stock | Great Western—Original | 100 | 100 |
| Stock | Lancashire and Yorkshire | 100 | 133 |
| Stock | London, Brighton, and South Coast | 100 | 123½ |
| Stock | London, Chatham, and Dover | 100 | 21½ |
| Stock | London and North-Western | 100 | 144½ |
| Stock | London and South-Western | 100 | 128 |
| Stock | Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln | 100 | 75½ |
| Stock | Metropolitan | 100 | 115 |
| Stock | Do., District | 100 | 53½ |
| Stock | Midland | 100 | 123 |
| Stock | North British | 100 | 90½ x d |
| Stock | North Eastern | 100 | 151½ |
| Stock | North London | 100 | 145 |
| Stock | North Staffordshire | 100 | 61 |
| Stock | South Devon | 100 | 66 |
| Stock | South-Eastern | 100 | 124 |

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTH.

OWEN—Oct. 2, at 5, Sloane-terrace, S.W., the wife of E. Annesley Owen, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

MARRIAGE.

BAKER—CARR—Oct. 10, at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, William Martyn Baker, solicitor, 10, Gray's-inn-square, to Isabelle, daughter of Robert Perry Carr, solicitor, Eastbourne.

DEATHS.

TAYLOR—Oct. 6, at Goldsmith buildings, Temple, Robert William Taylor, B.A., LL.B., barrister-at-law, aged 24.
WATSON—Oct. 2, at 3, Lansdown-crescent, Bath, Andrew Kippis Watson, barrister-at-law, aged 77.

IMPROVED AND ECONOMIC COOKERY.—As the art of cookery, more particularly the production of light made-dishes, savoury sauces and good soups, has become more general in this country, the absolute necessity of keeping a good "stock-pot" always ready at hand is now very generally recognised by all well-trained cooks. This has led to the very large and general household consumption of the genuine *Liebig's Extract of Meat*, now used almost by every family throughout the country. This Extract, made according to Baron Liebig's private and careful instructions from the finest fresh meat (1 lb. of Extract representing the concentrated meat flavouring parts of about 40 lbs. of pure meat), forms in reality the finest "stock" for flavouring beef-tea, soups, made-dishes, and sauces, the most convenient, keeping good for any length of time, and by far the cheapest, indeed cheaper, than any "stock" that could be made by an experienced cook from fresh butcher's meat. The *Liebig's Extract of Meat* therefore combines the three distinct advantages of high dietetic value, fine flavour, and great economy, and experience shows that, whenever it has been carefully tried, its use invariably becomes permanent. The jars are distinguished from those of imitation sorts by the fac-simile of Baron Liebig's signature in blue colour. —*Morning Post*.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Oct. 5, 1877.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Parkinson Beach Lead Mine Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 2, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon, on Nov 3. Mayhew, Walbrook, solicitor for the petitioner.

Surrey Masonic Hall Company, Limited.—Fry, J., has fixed Tuesday, Oct 16, at 11, at the chambers of the M.R. for the appointment of an official liquidator.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LAN CASTRE.

Liverpool United Land and Building Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 13, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Messrs. Cairns and Wise, Commerce court, Lord st, Liverpool. Tuesday, Nov 20, at 3, is appointed by the liquidators for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, Oct. 5, 1877.

Friendly Society, Bradley, Stafford Oct 2
Friendly Society, Hand Inn, Gwernafield, Flint Oct 2

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, Sept. 21, 1877.

Earp, Sarah, Manchester, Boot Maker. Oct 26. Tomlinson v Earp, Registrar Manchester District

Watson, James Foster, Waterloo, Lancashire, Registrar, Lancashire County Court. Oct 18. Grindley v Watson, Registrar Liverpool District

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Sept. 28, 1877.

Betten, William, Exeter. Nov 30. Friend, Exeter

Blackley, Thomas John, Belize, British Honduras, Esq. Nov 1.

Norris and Norris, Bedford row

Burton, Joseph, Bodmin, Cornwall, China Dealer. Oct 14. Wood and Co, Raymond buildings, Gray's inn

Carrington, Esther Clarke, Brighton. Oct 31. Wild and Co, Ironmonger lane

Canfield, Eliza, Newtown, Mont. Oct 31. Talbot and Co, Newtown

Cotgreave, William Parker, Christleton, Cheshire, Farmer. Nov 21.

Barker and Hignett, Chester

Crittenden, Sarah Elizabeth, Broom Lodge, Southgate. Nov 1.

Tatham and Sons, Staple inn

Dawson, John, Preston, Lancashire, Corn Merchant. Nov 10. Catterall, Preston

Elliott, John, Birchlea lane, Public Accountant. Nov 7. Wilkins and Co, St Swithin's lane

Markham, Sophia Charlotte, York. Nov 1. Bennett and Co, New sq, Lincoln's inn

Moore, Elizabeth, Bristol. Oct 31. Fumell and Co, Bristol

Papworth, Joseph, St Ives, Huntingdon, Retired Farmer. Nov 24.

Maule and Burton, Huntingdon

Paris, William Henry Thomas, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Provision Dealer. Nov 1. Swift, Liverpool

Poole, Eliza, Abbots Ripton, Huntingdon. Nov 1. Maule and Burton, Huntingdon

Richards, Ann, Southampton row. Nov 27. Wing and Du Cane, Gray's inn sq

Ross, William, Fobdown, Hants, Land Agent. Nov 17. Ross, Brambridge

Russell, Margaret Mary, Torquay, Devon. Nov 15. Southern, Ludlow

Spraggett, John, Banbury, Oxford, Gent. Oct 31. Welchman, Southam, Warwick

Stephenson, Isabella, Ulverston, Lancashire, Confectioner. Nov 10. Remington, Ulverston

Stroulger, Thomas Potten, Northampton, Currier. Nov 30. Becke and Green, Northampton

Wilby, Ann, Batley, York. Oct 20. Scholefield and Taylor, Batley

Wilby, Thomas, Batley, York, Gent. Oct 8. Scholefield and Taylor, Batley

TUESDAY, Oct. 2, 1877.

Blackmore, Isaac, St John's terrace, Westminster, Marble Mason. Oct 27. Smith, King William st

Carter, John Dowding, Aldgate, Wholesale Stationer. Dec 1. Slater and Poole, Manchester

De Clifford, Right Hon Edward Southwell, Baron, Kirkby Maltery, Leicester. Nov 30. Wing and Du Cane, Gray's inn sq

Evans, Evan, Bangor, Carnarvon. Gent. Nov 1. Hughes, Bangor

Francis, Charles Scotton, Blomfield rd, Melba hill. Nov 30. Dixon, John st, Bedford row

Graves, William, Leeds, Gent. Nov 1. Middleton and Sons, Leeds

Harvey, Elizabeth, Croydon, Surrey. Nov 21. Edgar, Poultry

Jamieson, Marion St Clair, Clifton, Bristol. Nov 15. Jacques, Bristol

King, Thomas, Sneinton, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer. Nov 8. Whittingham, Nottingham

Lake, Harry, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Brewer. Nov 1. Urry, Ryde

Lake, William, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Brewer. Oct 30. White, Ryde

Mansfield, Frederick, Wethersfield, Essex, Miller. Dec 31. Veley and Gunnington, Bramtree

Nunn, Rev Thomas, Stansted Rectory, Kent, Clerk. Nov 1. Nunn, Srecocks

Seaford, William Francis, Liverpool. Nov 18. Bateson and Co, Liverpool

Stevell, Samuel, Croydon, Surrey, Poulterer. Nov 3. Rowland, Croydon

Tanner, Melicent, Bath. Dec 1. Gill and Bush, Bath

Thompson, James, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Builder. Oct 23. Sobright and Co, Birkenhead

Tootal, Montague Robert, Surbiton, Private 5th Lancsers. Oct 31. Miller and Wiggins, Copthall court

Trappell, William, Bristol, Cabinet Maker. Nov 1. Miller, Bristol

Wingrove, Henry Robert, St. Kilda West, nr Melbourne, Victoria. Oct 25. Stubbs, John t, Bedford row

Wright, John, High Leigh, Cheshire, Farmer. Nov 1. Jones and Pride, Liverpool

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Oct. 5, 1877.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Holmes, Walton, Salmon's lane, Limehouse, Grocer. Pet Oct 2. Hazlett. Oct 17 at 12

Thomas, Hannah, Peter's lane, West Smithfield, Coffee House Keeper. Pet Sept 22. Murray. Oct 26 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Bright, Joseph, Briton Ferry, Glamorgan, Commission Agent. Pet Oct 3. Jones. Neath, Oct 17 at 10

Hird, Robert, Achery, Lincoln, Grocer. Pet Sept 26. Daubney. Great Grimaby, Oct 15 at 11

Rogers, Jeremiah Gawk, Stockport, Cheshire, Builder. Pet Oct 3. Hyde. Stockport, Oct 17 at 11

Sticks, Thomas, Almonduary, York, Sawyer. Pet Oct 1. Hird. Huddersfield, Oct 18 at 11

Werninck, Spencer, and Henry Rogers, Birmingham, Lamp Manufacturers. Pet Oct 3. Parry. Birmingham, Oct 25 at 11

TUESDAY, Oct. 9, 1877.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Cooke, Thomas Frederic, Marlborough st, Blackfriars, Builder. Pet Oct 4. Brougham. Oct 24 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Carter, Thomas Bell, Stockton-on-Tees, Auctioneer. Pet Oct 5. Crosby. Stockton-on-Tees, Oct 23 at 2.30

Lucas, Edwin J. F., Gravesend. Pet Oct 1. Hayward. Rochester, Nov 8 at 2

Lund, William Henry, Manchester, Manufacturers' Agent. Pet Oct 6. Lister, Manchester, Oct 22 at 10.30

Read, Edward, Dewsbury, York, Solicitor. Pet Oct 4. Nelson. Dewsbury, Oct 25 at 4

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, Oct. 5, 1877.

Hayward, James, Hertford, Jeweller. Oct 1

TUESDAY, Oct. 9, 1877.

Lane, Henry Murray, Orvington gardens, Brompton, Gent. Oct 5

Liquidations by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, Oct. 5, 1877.

Adamson, Thomas, Munster rd, Fulham, Proprietor of the "London Sporting Journal." Oct 18 at 11 at offices of Morris, Paternoster row

Adamson, William, Middleborough, Hatter. Oct 13 at 12 at Abbott's Railway Hotel, York. Teale, Middleborough

Alberga, Charles Augustus, Warwick rd, Malda hill, Civil Engineer. Oct 17 at 3 at the Bridge House Hotel, London bridge. Finch, Bridge chambers

Alway, William, Sodbury, Gloucester, out of business. Oct 19 at 11 at offices of Simmons and Clark, Manvers st, Bath

Arundel, William, South Bank, York, Grocer. Oct 16 at 3 at offices of Teale, Albert rd, Middleborough

Atkinson, John, Lower Park rd, Pockham, Woollen Rag Merchant. Oct 20 at 3.30 at offices of Chapman and Co, Gresham buildings, Basilsgate

Aye, Thomas, Stockton-on-Tees, Butcher. Oct 16 at 3 at offices of Bellringer, High st, Stockton-on-Tees

Baker, Swaffham, Norfolk, Auctioneer. Oct 18 at 12 at offices of Kent, St Andrew's Hall Plain, Norwich

Beardmore, Samuel, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Publican. Oct 18 at 3 at offices of Alcock, Market st, Tunstall

Benson, Jonah, Cheltenham, Tailor. Oct 23 at 11 at offices of Winterbotham and Co, Essex place, Cheltenham

Bentley, Henry, Earl Shilton, Leicester, Farmer. Oct 18 at 12 at offices of Preston, Church st, Huncley

Bentley, Thomas Hyett, Kent's Bank, Lancashire, Hotel Proprietor. Oct 3 at 11 at the Waterloo Hotel, Piccadilly, Manchester. Jellicoe and Bates, Manchester

Bettenson, Henry Richard Tregenna, Sandown, Isle of Wight, Painter. Oct 16 at 3 at Warburton's hotel, Quay st, Newport. Wooldridge, Sandown

Booth, Levi, Tunstall, Stafford, Hair Dresser. Oct 15 at 3 at 33, Cheapside, Hanley. Lawrence, Hanley

Berrows, William James, Woolwich, Whitcomb. Oct 18 at 3 at the Empress of India, Henry st, Woolwich. Cooper, Chancery lane

Carman, Frederick William, Ipswich, Cabinet Maker. Oct 20 at 3 at offices of Mills, Elm st, Ipswich

Carter, Isaac Richard, Sheffield, Boot Manufacturer. Oct 15 at 12 at the rooms of the Sheffield District Incorporated Law Society, Aldine court, Sheffield. Eam, Sheffield

Chadwick, James, Lower Cromptall, Lancashire, Contractor. Oct 25 at 3 at offices of Horner, Ridgefield, Manchester. Ambler, Manchester

Chester, Charles, St Andrew's hill, Hat Manufacturer. Oct 30 at 3 at offices of Rathbone, Fenchurch st

Critchlow, George Alder, Derby. Oct 17 at 3 at the Red Lion Inn, Wirksworth. Potter, Derby

Crust, Frederick, Stafford, Builder. Oct 17 at 11 at the Queen's Hotel, New st, Birmingham. Eaden, Birmingham

Currie, James, Narberth, Penbroke, Draper. Oct 16 at 10.15 at offices of Griffiths, St Mary st, Cardiff

- Cuthbertson, William Harrison, Pontre, nr Pontypridd, Surgeon. Oct 20 at 1 at offices of Simons and Pious, Church st, Merthyr Tydfil.
- Daniel, William, Heilfach, Glamorgan, Butcher. Oct 22 at 12 at the New Inn Hotel, Pontypridd. Thomas, Pontypridd.
- Davey, Henry, Queen's rd, Dalton, Boot Dealer. Oct 16 at 3 at offices of Durant, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st.
- Day, Charles, Cardiff, Tobacconist. Oct 19 at 11 at offices of Morgan and Scott, High st, Cardiff.
- Dean, Michael, Holloway, Cardiff, Chemist. Oct 18 at 11 at offices of Morgan and Scott, High st, Cardiff.
- Dehson, William, Darlington, Grocer. Oct 17 at 11 at offices of Robinson, Chancery lane, Durham.
- Dudney, Lucy Anne, Henley-on-Thames, Fancy Dealer. Oct 13 at 10 at offices of Deacon and Johnson, Ludgate hill. Hicks, Globe rd Mile End.
- Farrer, Henry, Mo's Side, nr Manchester, Salesman. Oct 23 at 3 at the Brunswick Hotel-1, Piccadilly, Manchester. Newton, Stockport.
- Ford, William, Watford, Hertford, Builder. Oct 15 at 12 at the Clarendon Hotel, Watford. Dantona and Co, Gray's inn sq.
- Foster, Janet, Leicester, out of business. Oct 18 at 12 at offices of Wright, Gallowtree gate, Leicester.
- Fox, David, Bolton, York, Farmer. Oct 19 at 11 at the Three Tans Hotel, Thirsk, Yorkshire, Northallerton.
- Front, Frederick, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Tailor. Oct 25 at 2 at the Sea Lion Hotel, High st, Hanley.
- Gallimore, Joseph, St Helen's, Lancashire, Boot Dealer. Oct 17 at 11 at offices of Grace, Book st, Liverpool.
- Gardner, William Walter, Erington, Warwick, Boiler Maker. Oct 16 at 11 at offices of Stansbury, Bennett's hill, Birmingham.
- Gatley, Edward Periam Heath, Luppitt, Devon, Gent. Oct 18 at 3 at offices of Gidley, Bedford circus, Exeter.
- Gelder, George, Barnby-upon-the-Marsh, York, Farmer. Oct 18 at 12 at offices of Wright, Abbey place, Selby.
- Gorris, Thomas Edwin, New Barnet, Draper. Oct 19 at 3 at offices of Priestly and Co, Cheapside. Lucas, Clifford's inn.
- Graham, Gordon, Tottenham, Coal Merchant. Oct 25 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Wolferstan.
- Graham, William, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Wholesale Fruiterer. Oct 19 at 2 at offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- Griffiths, John, Birmingham, Coal Merchant. Oct 18 at 12 at offices of of Hawkes and Weekes, Temple st, Birmingham.
- Hall, John, Preston, Manufacturer. Oct 23 at 3 at offices of Grundy and Kershaw, Booth st, Manchester.
- Harris, Henry Kingdand, Jeremiah st, Poplar, Licensed Victualler. Oct 15 at 3 at offices of Smyth, Rochester row, Westminster.
- Hinchey, James Archer, Guiseley, nr Leeds, Auctioneer. Oct 18 at 2 at offices of Wells, East parade, Leeds.
- Homer, Benjamin, Lozells, nr Birmingham, Gunlock Maker. Oct 16 at 12 at offices of East, Eldon chambers, Cherry st, Birmingham.
- Hubbard, Charles, Wakefield, Fishmonger. Oct 17 at 11 at offices of Lake, Southgate, Wakefield.
- Hughes, James Bilaland, Conway, Carnarvon, Cabinet Maker. Oct 18 at 3 at the Law Association Rooms, Cook st, Liverpool. Jones, Conway.
- Hunter, Robert Goehrane, Leytonstone, Essex, Wholesale Ironmonger. Oct 22 at 11 at office of Kerby, Great Winchester st.
- Johnson, Henry, Prescott, Lancashire, Baker. Oct 19 at 3 at offices of Spencely, South John st, Liverpool.
- Jones, John Teague, Briton Ferry, Glamorgan, Commission Agent. Oct 19 at 11 at offices of Howell, Steepney st, Llanelli.
- Jones, Thomas, Whitland, Carmarthen, Ale Merchant. Oct 19 at 2 at offices of Lancelotti, Narberth.
- Kenworthy, Charles, Old Trafford, Lancashire, Beerhouse Keeper. Oct 18 at 3 at offices of Knowles, Tib lane, Manchester.
- Lefever, Alfred, and Walter Alexander Lefever, Hackney rd, Timber Merchants. Oct 24 at 3 at offices of Wilkins and Co, St Swithin's lane.
- Lichtenstein, Simpson, South st, Finsbury, Merchant. Oct 15 at 12 at offices of Phelps and Co, Gresham st.
- Lindsay, James, Darlington, Fruiterer. Oct 13 at 11 at offices of Barron High rd, Darlington.
- Lorimer, John, Bradford, Travelling Draper. Oct 15 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson, Market st, Bradford.
- Madgwile, George, Ferrihurst, Sussex, Farmer. Oct 20 at 3 at the King's Arms Inn, Haslemere, Surrey. Addition, Portsmouth.
- Magnus, Daniel, Mincing lane, Commission Agent. Oct 24 at 3 at offices of Lewis and Lewis, Ely place, Hilborn.
- McDonough, William Richard, Swansea, Surgeon Dentist. Oct 16 at 11 at offices of Thomas, York place, Swansea.
- Moffatt, Charles, Wakefield, Baker. Oct 23 at 11 at the Royal Hotel, Wood st, Wakefield. Lodge, Wakefield.
- Myatt, Joseph, Abergavenny, Mon, Greengrocer. Oct 24 at 3 at offices of Jones, Frogmore st, Abergavenny.
- Nadin, John, Worthing, Sussex, Hotel Keeper. Oct 22 at 12 at the Brunswick Hotel, Worthing. Stuckey, Brighton.
- Page, William, Kingston-upon-Thames, Boot Maker. Oct 19 at 12 at offices of Wilkinson and Howlett, Bedford rd, Covent garden.
- Parrington, James, Birmingham, Builder. Oct 16 at 10 at 15 at offices of East, Eldon chambers, Cherry st, Birmingham.
- Pearcy, Andrew, Ash, Surrey, Builder. Oct 15 at 12 at the County and Borough Hall, Guildford, Surrey. Gusch, Guildford.
- Pelling, Edward, Croydon, Surrey, Grocer. Oct 22 at 12 at 7, Mark lane. Preston.
- Pilkington, Joseph, Nottingham, Warehouseman. Oct 26 at 11 at offices of Bright, Town Club chambers, Wheeler gate, Nottingham.
- Pilkington, Thomas, Leeds, Tailor. Oct 16 at 3 at offices of Lodge, Park row, Leeds.
- Priestley, Lester, Bradford, Cabinet Maker. Oct 20 at 10 at offices of Lancaster and Wright, Manor row, Bradford.
- Procter, Alfred Edgcumbe, Barton-under-Needwood, Stafford, Surgeon. Oct 18 at 12 at the White Hart Hotel, Barton-under-Trent. Flint, Derby.
- Ribbel, George, Oldham, Lancashire, Tailor. Oct 19 at 3 at the Mitre Hotel, Cathedral gate, Manchester. Buckley and Clegg, Oldham.
- Robinson, A'am, Clayton Hall, nr Accrington, Gentleman's Servant. Oct 17 at 4 at offices of Atkinson, Tyrel st, Bradford.
- Romanio, Alfonso, Strand, Restaurateur. Oct 24 at 2 at offices of Baker and Co, Clock lane, Cannon st.
- Rundle, William, Plymouth, Balider. Oct 19 at 12 at offices of Pearce, Princess sq, Plymouth.
- Shilling, Stephen, Tottenham, Commission Agent. Oct 17 at 4 at offices of Best, Kingston-on-Thames.
- Steer, George, Croydon, Butcher. Oct 23 at 2 at offices of Fallon, Basinghall st.
- Stephany, Benjamin, Crispin at, Spitalfields market, China Dealer. Oct 13 at 10 at offices of Goatly, Westminster bridge rd.
- Stormont, James Glazebrook, Birmingham, Brass Founder. Oct 19 at 12 at offices of Poynton, Temple row west, Birmingham.
- Tate, Thomas, Kingston-upon-Hull, Draper. Oct 19 at 11 at offices of Reed, St Mary's chambers, Lowgate, Hull.
- Taylor, John William, and John William Sutcliffe, Manchester, Brush Manufacturers. Oct 22 at 3 at offices of Leigh, Brown st, Manchester.
- Terry, Edward, Greenfield, Flint, Grocer. Oct 15 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Chester. Evans, Holywell.
- Tite, Henry Alfred, Old Kent rd, Provision Merchant. Oct 18 at 3 at offices of Hicklin and Washington, Trinity sq, Southwark.
- Titterton, George, sen, Chaddesden Common, nr Derby, Farmer. Oct 22 at 2 at offices of Moody, Corn market, Derby.
- Trendal, Edward Thomas, Bishopthorpe, York, Joiner. Oct 24 at 12 at offices of Wilkinson, St Helen's sq, York.
- Turton, Joseph Pym, Ripley, Derby, Grocer. Oct 18 at 11 at the Bell Hotel, Sadler gate, Derby. Carahan, Ripley.
- Tweedale, John, Rochdale, Joiner. Oct 18 at 3 at offices of Standing, King st, Rochdale.
- Twite, Charles, Gresham st, Warehouseman. Oct 23 at 2 at offices of Lovering, Gresham st. Hughes, St Benet place, Gracechurch at.
- Unitt, John, Bistol, Wine Dealer. Oct 17 at 11 at offices of Fellowes, Mount Pleasant, Bistol.
- Vicary, John, Hircornie, Wheelwright. Oct 18 at 11 at offices of Thorpe, Castle st, Barnstable.
- Waterer, Joseph, and William Charles Martin, Aldersgate st, Costume Manufacturers. Oct 26 at 11 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Chapman, London wall.
- Weatherall, John, Durham, Grocer. Oct 19 at 11 at offices of Chapman, Market place, Durham.
- Webb, William, Hardinge st, Commercial rd east, out of business. Oct 20 at 12 at offices of Fletcher and Co, Staple inn.
- Wesall, Rev William, Wy-wiley, nr Uxbridge. Oct 24 at 3 at the Chequers Hotel, Uxbridge. Salaman, King st, Cheapside.
- Wilkinson, Andrew, York, Grocer. Oct 19 at 11 at offices of Crumlie, Stonegate, York.
- Wilcox, Joseph, Clifton crescent, Old Kent rd, out of business. Oct 11 at 10 at offices of Goatly, Westminster bridge rd.
- Williams, John, Dolzelley, Merioneth, Ironmonger. Oct 20 at 3 at offices of Jones and Davies, Dolzelley.
- Wion, Charles Thomas, Cophall buildings, Stockbroker. Oct 13 at 2 at offices of Allingham, Old Broad st.
- Tussart, Oct 9, 1877.
- Aldridge, Charles Suffolk, Billerica, Essex, Baker. Oct 27 at 11 at the Saracen's Head Hotel, Chelmsford. Lewis and Son, Brentwood.
- Ansell, George Frederick, Cromwell rd, St Pancras, Coal Merchant. Oct 22 at 12 at offices of Cronin and Rivolta, Southampton st, Bloomsbury.
- Austin, Charles, Clapham park rd, Clothier. Oct 17 at 12 at 21, Upper Kennington lane. Gladly.
- Back, Henry, Bedford, Grocer. Oct 22 at 11 at offices of Conquest and Clare, Duke st, Bedford.
- Banton, William, Lambeth walk, Draper. Oct 29 at 12 at offices of Stockpoole, Pinners' Hall, Old Broad st.
- Barnacle, Arthur, and Edgar Robins, Leeds, Coal Merchants. Oct 22 at 1 at the Wharton's Hotel, Park lane, Leeds. Watson, Leeds.
- Barne, Edward, West Derby, Coach Builder. Oct 21 at 12 at offices of Sherwin and Dean, Lord st, Liverpool.
- Barrow, Robert James, Bristol, Grocer. Oct 22 at 3 at offices of Salmon and Henderson, Broad st, Bristol.
- Barrett, Andrew, London, Grocer. Oct 22 at 11 at offices of Davies, Abchurch place, North.
- Beare, Thomas, Bamford Spoke, Devon, Yeoman. Oct 20 at 11 at offices of Fewings, Queen st, Exeter. Huggins.
- Bennett, Richard Hamer, Kingston, Hereford, General Dealer. Oct 22 at 2 at the Oak Inn, Leominster. Pratt and Davies.
- Bibby, George, Accrington, Machinist. Oct 22 at 3 at the Peel's Arms, Whalley rd, Accrington. Whalley, Accrington.
- Birch, William Dix, Nottingham, Boot Maker. Oct 22 at 12 at offices of Lees, jun, Middle pavement, Nottingham.
- Birks, Samuel, Longton, Beer-seller. Oct 23 at 11 at offices of Welch, Caroline st, Longton.
- Black, William, Abchurch House, Commission Agent. Oct 25 at 2 at offices of Linklater and Co, Walbrook.
- Bowring, Thomas, Stafford, Fishmonger. Oct 19 at 11 at offices of Smallwood, Newport, Salop.
- Brewster, James Edward, Dewsbury, Carriage Builder. Oct 22 at 3 at offices of Ridgway and Ridgway, Church st, Dewsbury.
- Brine, David, Bradford, Game Dealer. Oct 20 at 11 at offices of Skipton, York. Robinson and Robinson.
- Brown, Frederick, Bromsgrove, Worcester, Farmer. Oct 25 at 12 at offices of Benley, Foregate st, Worcester.
- Bruerton, George Wallace, Banbury, Oxford, Innkeeper. Oct 20 at 3 at the George and Dragon Inn, Banbury. Pain and Hawtin, Banbury.
- Burgess, Charles, Middlesborough, Boot Dealer. Oct 20 at 10 at 16, Albert rd, Middlesborough. Teale, Middlesborough.
- Campbell, William, Upper Norwood, of no occupation. Oct 29 at 3 at offices of Bradley, Mark lane.
- Charlton, James, Kensington rd, Commercial Traveller. Oct 22 at 10 at 15 at offices of Netherall, Eldon st, Finsbury.
- Clarke, Dick, and Enoch Hollishead, Swinton, nr Rotherham, Nail Manufacturers. Oct 19 at 11 at offices of Willis, Church st, Rotherham.
- Clayton, Joseph, Edgeley, Stockport, Bricklayer. Oct 20 at 10 at offices of Coppock and Co, Vernon st, Stockport.
- Clemens, William, Winstanley rd, Battersea, Grocer. Oct 22 at 3 at offices of Greatorex, Chancery lane.
- Cole, Samuel Galpin, Rochester, Hosier. Oct 20 at 2 at offices of of Frickett and Co, Cheapside. Philip, Budge row.

Crawford, Robert, South Shields, Builder. Oct 23 at 3 at offices of
 Kennelwood, King st, South Shields
 Crawshaw, George, Manchester, Provision Dealer. Oct 22 at 11 at
 offices of Sutton and Elliott, Fountain st, Manchester
 Crawshaw, Thomas Ridding, Stapleton, Farmer. Oct 23 at 3 at offices
 of Owston, Friar lane, Leicester
 Crozier, William Robert, Stockton-on-Tees, Grocer. Oct 18 at 11 at
 offices of Best, St John's rd, Stockton-on-Tees
 Cullley, Samuel Hall, and Richard Palethorpe Cullley, Plymouth, Pro-
 vision Merchants. Oct 22 at 12.30 at the Grand Hotel, Broad st,
 Bristol. Pearce, Plymouth
 Davies, Edward, Llandilo, Carnarvon, Grocer. Oct 22 at 1 at the
 Cardiff Arms Hotel, Cardiff. Bishop, Llandilo
 Downes, Alfred, Longton, Confectioner. Oct 22 at 11 at the White
 Horse, Longton
 Easterbrook, Richard, Ashburton, Brewer. Oct 23 at 11 at offices of
 Firth, East st, Ashburton
 Edge, John, Harshill, Stock-upon-Trent, Grocer. Oct 15 at 11.30 at
 offices of Stevenson, Chesapeake, Hanley
 Edwards, John Lewis, Cae-harris, Glamorgan, Grocer. Oct 16 at 11 at
 offices of Lewis, Gwleland st, Merthyr Tydfil
 Ellis, Richard, Blackpool, Draper. Oct 25 at 2 at offices of Black-
 hurst, Fox st, Preston
 Elvry, Henry James, Copenhagen st, Islington. Oct 20 at 2 at offices
 of Noon and Clarke, Blomfield st
 Fielding, Henry, Oldham, Plumber. Oct 25 at 2 at offices of Whitaker,
 St Peter st, Oldham
 Galeworthy, George, Newport, Mon, Confectioner. Oct 19 at 12 at
 offices of Gibbs, Tredgar place, Newport
 Gos, William, Crumpsall, nr Manchester, Builder. Oct 24 at 3 at offices
 of Adleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester
 Gilbert, John, Coventry, Grocer. Oct 23 at 2 at offices of Minster,
 Trinity churchyard, Coventry
 Godwin, John, Birmingham, Brush Maker. Oct 23 at 11 at offices of
 Mason, New st, Birmingham
 Goodall, William Henry, Kidsgrove, Ironmonger. Oct 19 at 11 at the
 Copeland Arms Hotel, Stoke-upon-Trent. Sherratt, Kidsgrove
 Hadden, Alexander, Westminster bridge rd, out of business. Oct 29 at
 12 at offices of Preece, jun, Raymond buildings, Gray's inn
 Harvey, Charles, East Bergholt, Suffolk, Builder. Oct 31 at 12 at the
 White Hart Hotel, Manningtree, Pollard, Ipswich
 Hassell, Charles, Crewe, Stationer. Oct 19 at 10 at 75, Market st
 Crewe. Peinton, Crewe
 Hinds, William, Montpelier vale, Blackheath, Fruiterer. Oct 16 at 1
 at offices of Randall and Angier, Gray's inn place
 Hobson, George, Birmingham, Auctioneer. Oct 24 at 11 at offices of
 Mason, New st, Birmingham
 Home, George, Bures Hamlet, Essex, Butcher. Oct 20 at 12 at the
 Queen's Head, Bures. Cardinall, Halstead
 Isaac, Samuel, Cross lane, St Mary-at-hill, Merchant. Oct 22 at 1.30
 at offices of Simpson and Palmer, Three Crown sq, Southwark
 James, Septimus Frederick, Aston Manor, Warwick, Corn Factor.
 Oct 19 at 3 at offices of Jacques, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Jefferies, John Samuel, Bristol, India Rubber Manufacturer. Oct 16
 at 11 at offices of Campbell and Salmon, St Stephen st, Bristol
 Kendall, Edward Leader, Gloucester, Merchant. Oct 19 at 2.30 at
 offices of Taynton and Son, Clarence chambers, Clarence st,
 Gloucester
 Kershaw, John George, Wakefield, Fancy Draper. Oct 23 at 3 at offices
 of Lodge, Wood st, Wakefield
 Lambert, Thomas Jackson, Rock Ferry, Cheshire, Shop Superin-
 tendent. Nov 12 at 11 at offices of Eddy, Lord st, Liverpool
 Leah, William, John Crabtree, William Greenwood, Enoch Cockroft,
 and George Cockroft, Todmorden, Lancashire, Cotton Manufacturers.
 Oct 23 at 4 at offices of Adleshaw and Warburton, King st, Man-
 chester
 Martin, Henry, and Benjamin Hargreaves, Blackpool, Lancashire,
 Builders. Oct 22 at 2 at offices of Blackhurst, Lytham st, Black-
 pool
 Mayne, John, and John Henry Mayne, Gwennap, Cornwall, Mining
 Agents. Oct 18 at 12 at offices of Cock, Coomb's lane, Pydar st,
 Truro
 Midgley, James, Iltingworth, Halifax, Farmer. Oct 19 at 11 at offices
 of Longbottom, Northgate chambers, Halifax
 Mills, Thomas, Shaw, nr Oldham, Newsagent. Oct 22 at 11 at offices
 of Roberts, John st, Rochdale
 Mison, George, New North rd, Olman. Oct 24 at 3 at offices of Aird,
 Eastcheap
 Moorhouse, Benjamin, Bradford, Hay Dealer. Oct 22 at 4 at offices of
 Atkinson, Tyrell st, Bradford
 Mountford, James, Birmingham, Engineer. Oct 22 at 3 at offices of
 Wright and Marshall, Town Hall chambers, Birmingham
 Newnham, Benjamin Thomas, Bath, Coach Builder. Oct 19 at 11.30
 at offices of Andrews and Mason, Ironmonger lane. Bartrum, Bath
 Nunn, Alfred, Tooting, Coal Merchant. Oct 29 at 3 at Park Cottage,
 Garratt lane, Tooting. Jones, Bank buildings, Wandsworth
 Osborne, Edward, Cardiff, Boot Maker. Oct 19 at 3 at offices of Tribe
 and Co, Crookherbtown, Cardiff. Dalton and Co, Cardiff
 Parker, George, and Thomas Munday Parker, Scawby, Lincoln
 Tanners. Oct 24 at 11 at offices of Hett and Co, Brigg
 Perrins, William Henry, Smeaton, Nottingham, Draper. Oct 26 at 12
 at offices of Biddle, St Peter's chambers, Nottingham
 Phillips, George, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. Oct 18 at 3 at offices of
 Campbell and Salmon, St Stephen st, Bristol
 Phillips, Thomas William, Chatham, Grocer. Oct 26 at 11 at offices of
 Stephenson, St Margaret's Bank, Rochester
 Pinder, Mark, Leeds, Builder. Oct 23 at 3 at offices of Spirett, East
 parade, Leeds
 Pollard, James, Bristol, Tailor. Oct 25 at 2 at offices of Roper, Nicholas
 st, Bristol
 Pratt, Alfred John, Merthyr Dofas, Glamorgan, Farmer. Oct 16 at 2
 at offices of Gitch and Corbett, Quay st, Cardiff
 Purvis, Samuel, Alnwick, Northumberland, Provision Merchant. Oct
 22 at 3 at offices of Middlemas, Bondgate without, Alnwick
 Richardson, Thomas, jun, Stockport, Timber Merchant. Oct 23 at 3
 at offices of Nuttall and Son, John Dalton st, Manchester
 Robbins, Hugh, Coleford, Somerset, Builder. Oct 25 at 12.30 at the
 Grand Hotel, Broad st, Bristol. Cruittwell and Co, Frome

Robins, George, Abertillery, Mon, Painter. Oct 22 at 2.30 at offices of
 Morgan, Pontypool
 Rushforth, William, New Briggate, Leeds, Florist. Oct 22 at 3 at
 offices of Granger, Bank st, Leeds
 Settle, William Henry, York, Butcher. Oct 19 at 11 at offices of Gray-
 ston, New st, York
 Simons, George, Clarence rd, Lower Clapton, House Decorator. Oct 20
 at 12 at offices of Tiddeman, Finsbury sq
 Skelding, Charles, Halesowen, Worcester, Boot Manufacturer. Oct 18
 at 11 at offices of Homer, High st, Brierley Hill
 Smart, George, Hove, Sussex, out of business. Oct 21 at 3 at offices of
 Goodman, North st, Brighton
 Smith, George, Louth, Shipwright. Oct 22 at 11 at offices of Sharpley,
 Cannon st, Louth
 Smith, Jabez, Kirbymorside, York, Spirit Merchant. Oct 26 at 1 at
 offices of Pearson, Holmsey
 Stait, Job, Small Heath, Warwick, Coal Dealer. Oct 23 at 11 at offices
 of Burton, Union passage, Birmingham
 Street, Joel, Biggin, Derby, Contractor. Oct 19 at 11 at offices of Hol-
 land and Rigby, Full st, Derby
 Taylor, Edwin, Bridlington Quay, Hotel Keeper. Oct 23 at 1 at
 Harker's York Hotel, York. Richardson and Co, York
 Thomas, John, and Evan Evans, Llandudno, Carnarvon, Builders.
 Oct 20 at 12 at offices of Sheen and Broadhurst, North John st, Liver-
 pool. Chamberlain, Llandudno
 Thorne, Henry, Leicester, Builder. Oct 26 at 3 at offices of Wright,
 Belvoir st, Leicester
 Traver, Frederick George, Bournemouth, Lodging House Keeper.
 Oct 22 at 3 at offices of Lacey and Son, Avenue rd, Bournemouth
 Tugman, Samuel, Liverpool, Commission Merchant. Dec 6 at 2 at
 offices of Pemberton and Co, Harrington st, Liverpool
 Waddington, Richard, York, Boot Maker. Oct 25 at 11 at offices of
 Dale, Museum st, York
 Walpole, William Henry, Nottingham, Schoolmaster. Oct 27 at 11 at
 offices of Briggs, Amen alley, Derby
 Watts, Henry, Duddington, Cambridge, Baker. Oct 25 at 12.30 at
 offices of Richardson, Chatteris
 Way, Robert, Bristol, Upholsterer. Oct 16 at 3 at offices of Campbell
 and Salmon, St Stephen st, Bristol
 Wharton, Matthew, Batley Carr, nr Dewsbury, Woollen Manu-
 facturer. Oct 22 at 2 at offices of Scholes and Son, Leeds rd, Dew-
 sbury
 White, Thomas, Carnarvon, Licensed Victualler. Oct 29 at 3 at offices
 of Jones and Roberts, Church st, Carnarvon
 Wilkinson, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Ale Dealer. Oct 22 at 2 at
 offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Witham, William George, Raiton rd, Herne hill, Grocer. Oct 16 at 3
 at offices of Bath, King William st. Chippfield, Trinity st, South-
 wark
 Worland, William John, Wetherall rd, South Hackney, Composer.
 Oct 17 at 10 at the Union Tavern, Vivian rd, Old Ford. Hicks,
 Grove rd, Victoria park
 Yardley, Joseph, Cradley Heath, Licensed Victualler. Oct 22 at 11
 at offices of Lowe, Wolverhampton st, Dudley

WIPE YOUR FEET.

BEST DOOR MATS
 TRELOAR AND SONS,
 69, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON, E.C.

PAINLESS DENTISTRY.

MR. G. H. JONES,

SURGEON DENTIST,

57, GREAT RUSSELL-STREET, LONDON

(Immediately opposite the British Museum).

Has obtained Her Majesty's Royal Letters Patent for his perfectly
 painless system of adapting

(Prize Medal, London and Paris)

ARTIFICIAL TEETH BY ATMOSPHERIC PRESSURE.
 Pamphlet Gratis and Post-free.

EDE AND SON

ROBE MAKERS



BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench
 Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS &c
 ESTABLISHED 1669.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

THE LONDON ASSURANCE.

(Incorporated by Royal Charter, A.D. 1720.)

FOR FIRE, LIFE, AND MARINE ASSURANCES.

Head Office:—No. 7, ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON, E.C.

WEST-END AGENTS:
Messrs. GRINDLAY & Co., 55, Parliament-street, S.W.

Governor—EDWARD BUDD, Esq.

Sub-Governor—MARK WILKS COLLET, Esq.

Deputy-Governor—WILLIAM RENNIE, Esq.

Directors.

H. Gough Arbuthnot, Esq.
Robert Burn Blyth, Esq.
William T. Brand, Esq.
Major-General H. P. Burn.
George W. Campbell, Esq.
George B. Dawhurst, Esq.
Robert B. Dobree, Esq.
George L. M. Gibbs, Esq.
Robert Gillespie, Esq.
Howard Gilliat, Esq.
Henry Goschen, Esq.
Edwin Gower, Esq.

A. C. Guthrie, Esq.
Louis Huth, Esq.
Henry J. B. Kendall, Esq.
Charles Lyell, Esq.
Capt. R. W. Pelly, R.N.
David Powell, Esq.
P. F. Robertson, Esq.
Robert Byrie, Esq.
David P. Selilar, Esq.
Col. Leopold Seymour.
Lewis A. Wallace, Esq.
William B. Watson, Esq.

Solicitors.

Messrs. Johnsons, Upton, Budd, & Atkey, 20, Austinfriars. | Messrs. Collyer-Bristow, Withers & Russell, 4, Bedford-row.

NOTICE is hereby given that the fifteen days of grace allowed for renewal of Michaelmas Policies will expire on 14th October.

The Directors invite applications for Agencies.

Prospectuses, copies of the Fire, Life, and Marine Accounts, and all other information can be had on application.

JOHN F. LAURENCE, Secretary.

LAW UNION FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Chief Office—136, Chancery-lane, London, W.C.
The Funds in hand and Capital subscribed amount to upwards of £1,400,000 sterling.

Chairman—JAMES CUDDON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Goldsmith-build- ing, Temple.
Deputy-Chairman—C. PEMBERTON, Esq. (Lee & Pemberton), Solicitor 44, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Every description of Fire and Life Insurance business transacted.
The Directors invite attention to the new form of Life Policy, which is free from all conditions.

The Company advances Money on Mortgage of Life Interest and Reversions, whether absolute or contingent.

Prospectuses, Copies of the Directors' Report, and Annual Balance Sheet, and every information, sent post free, on application to

FRANK M'GEDDY, Actuary and Secretary.

ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY

(Limited), 7, Bank-buildings, Lombury, E.C.

General Accidents.
Railway Accidents.

Personal Injuries.
Death by Accidents.

C. HARDING, Manager.

THE AGRA BANK (LIMITED)

Established in 1833.—Capital, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS-LANE, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON.

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are kept at the Head Office on the terms customary with London bankers, and interest allowed when the credit balance does not fall below £100.

DEPOSITS received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:—
At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 12 months' notice of withdrawal.
For shorter periods deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

BILLS issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank free of extra charge; and approved bills purchased or sent for collection.

SALES AND PURCHASES effected in British and foreign securities, in East India Stock and loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn, and army, navy, and civil pay and pensions realized.
Every other description of banking business and money agency, British and Indian, transacted.
J. THOMSON, Chairman.

LONDON GAZETTE (published by authority) and LONDON and COUNTRY ADVERTISEMENT OFFICE.

No. 117, CHANCERY LANE, FLEET STREET.

HENRY GREEN, Advertisement Agent, begs to direct the attention of the Legal Profession to the advantages of his long experience of upwards of thirty years, in the special insertion of all pro forma notices, &c., and hereby solicits their continued support.—N.B. One copy of advertisement only required, and the strictest care and promptitude assured. Officially stamped forms for advertisement and file of "London Gazette" kept. By appointment.

ONE PENNY PER FOLIO. ABSTRACTS

ONE PENNY PER FOLIO. Bills of Costs.

ONE PENNY PER FOLIO. Briefs.

ONE PENNY PER FOLIO. Fair Copy.

Hooper & Sons, 69, Ludgate-hill.

STUART-BARKER & SON,

SURVEYORS AND AUCTIONEERS,

36, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON BRIDGE, E.C.

RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

LAW STATIONER AND PRINTER,

3, WARWICK COURT, GRAY'S INN.

Deeds Abstracted on the Premises.

Plans Drawn to Scale if required.

ADVERTISING—C. H. MAY & CO.,

GENERAL ADVERTISING OFFICES,

78, Gracechurch-street, London, E.C. Established 1846.

ADVERTISEMENTS received for insertion in all newspapers, &c.

TO BARRISTERS and SOLICITORS.—A Handsome Suite of Chambers, at 40, Chancery-lane, on second floor containing four large, lofty, and light rooms, closed with outer doors and entrance hall. Rent £175. Also three large light Chambers to be let on hall ground floor. Rent £75. Apply to the PORTER, in the Building, or to Messrs. F. CHIFFEDEL & Co., 38, Chancery-lane.

WALKER'S CRYSTAL CASE WATCHES are superseding all others.—Prize Medals, London, 1862; Paris, 1867. Gold from £15 15s.; Silver from £6 6s.—68, Cornhill; 299 Regent-street 76, Strand.

PARTRIDGE & COOPER,

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL STATIONERS

192, Fleet-street, and 1 & 2, Chancery-lane, London, E.C.

Carriage paid to the Country on Orders exceeding 20s.
DRAFT PAPER, 5s. 6s. 6d., 7s. 6d., 7s. 9d., and 9s. 9d. per ream.
BRIEF PAPER, 15s. 6d., 17s. 6d., and 23s. 6d. per ream.
FOOLSCAP PAPER, 10s. 6d., 14s. 6d., and 18s. 6d. per ream.
CREAM-LAID NOTE, 3s. 4s., and 5s. per ream.
LARGE CREAM-LAID NOTE, 4s. 6d., 6s. 6d., and 8s. per ream.
LARGE BLUE NOTE, 3s. 6d., 4s. 6d., and 6s. 6d. per ream.
ENVELOPES, CREAM OR BLUE, 3s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 6s. 6d. per 1000.
THE "TEMPLE" ENVELOPE, extra secure, 9s. 6d. per 1000.
FOOLSCAP OFFICIAL ENVELOPES, 1s. 9d. per 100.

PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S VELLUM WOVE CLUB-HOUSE NOTE, 9s. 6d. per ream. This incomparable Paper has raised up a host of worthless imitations. Purchasers are particularly requested to observe that each sheet bears the fac-simile water-mark, "PARTRIDGE COOPER'S VELLUM-WOVE CLUB-HOUSE PAPER," without which none is genuine.

INVESTURE SKINS, Printed and Machine-ruled, 2s. 5d. each, 25s. 60s., 125s. per roll.

SECOND OR FOLLOWERS, Ruled, 2s. 1d. each, 24s. per dozen, 115s. per roll.

RECORDS OR MEMORIALS, 8d. each, 7s. 6d. per dozen.

Ledgers, Day Books, Cash Books, Letter or Minute Books.

An immense stock in various bindings.

MUCH TIME AND WORRY SAVED

BY SORTING YOUR PAPERS INTO

STONE'S PATENT BOXES AND CABINETS.

"Exceedingly useful."—"Standard."

Sold by Stationers everywhere. Illustrated Catalogues post-free from HENRY STONE, MANUFACTURER & PATENTEE, BANBURY.

All Sizes can be seen at

13, CRANBOURNE-STREET, LEICESTER-SQUARE, LONDON.

The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice.

The BOOKS and FORMS kept in stock for immediate use MEMORANDA and ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps Railway Registration Forms.

Solicitors' Account Books.

RICHARD FLINT & CO.

(Late ASH & FLINT),

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet street, London, E.C. (corner of Surgeons'-inn).

Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed.